EARLY MONASTIC BUDDHISM

VOLUME II

Calcutta Oriental Series No. 30

EARLY MONASTIC BUDDHISM

VOLUME II

BY

NALINAKSHA DUTT,

M.A., B.L., P.H.D. (Cal.), D.LITT. (Lond.),

Premchand Roychand Scholar
Lecturer, Post-graduate Department of Pali and Ancient Indian History & Culture, Calcutta University; Philological Secretary, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal

CALCUTTA

1945

PREFACE

The three Buddhist Councils are the three landmarks in the history and development of early monastic Buddhism. In the first volume of this work, an attempt has been made to present the history and doctrines of early Buddhism as far as can be gathered from the *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya*. This volume has been brought to a close with the account of the first Buddhist Council, in which the direct disciples of Buddha met together to ascertain and compile the scattered discourses of the Founder. Though a discordant note is perceptible in the proceedings of the first Council, the Saṅgha was able to maintain its concord at least outwardly for about a century or a little less than a century. The disruptive forces were already at work within the Saṅgha and the Second Buddhist Council marked the complete cleavage of the Saṅgha into two groups, each of which again became divided into a few sub-groups. After the session of the second Council, the Saṅgha was no longer one but many, and each sub-Saṅgha considered itself independent and felt justified in giving its own interpretation to the teachings and disciplinary rules promulgated by the Teacher. Hence the history of Buddhism after the second Council is no longer the history of one group of thinkers but of the many groups of thinkers that came into being in the wake of the first cleavage. About a half of the present volume has therefore been devoted to the study and discussion of the materials available relating to the history, literature and doctrines of the many groups and subgroups. This has been followed up by four chapters, the first dealing with the gradual change of relation of laity to the church, the second with the career of the religion during the regime of

the Mauryas particularly Aśoka, the third with Aśoka's *Dhamma* and the fourth with the third Buddhist Council which marked the climax of sectarian differences and an effort of the Theravadins to propagate their point of view about Buddha's teachings in the different parts of India. This volume has been brought to a close with an analysis of the popular features which the religion incorporated in the pre-Aśokan and post-Aśokan period, thus paving the way for the advent of Mahāyānism.

For the convenience of the general reader not acquainted with the phraseology of the Buddhist texts, an exhaustive index of the Pāli and Sanskrit words with their nearest English renderings has been added to this volume. There is also a general index of both the volumes. Owing to the difficulties due to the last world-war there has been some delay in printing the second volume. I must again thank Mr. P. Das, Manager, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, for seeing this volume through the Press and preparing the two indexes.

N. Dutt

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

FROM AJĀTASATTU TO NĀGADĀSAKA

In the history of Buddhism, the session of the First Buddhist Council coincides with the eighth year of king Ajātasattu's reign. Ajātasattu extended his father's dominion beyond Magadha and ruled over Aṅga, Kāśī and the states of the Vajjian confederacies.[1] The Buddhist traditions are unanimous in stating that Ajātasattu in his early days was not very well-disposed towards Buddha and his religion, but later on he changed and became a patron of the religion, and whole-heartedly lent his support to the session of the First Council.

In the *Mahāvaṃsa*[2] and the *Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa*[3] (henceforth abbreviated as *Mmk.*), Ajātasattu's enthusiasm for rendering service to the new religion is referred to but there is no evidence to show that his interest for the propagation of the religion was anything notable.

UDĀYIBHADDA

According to the Buddhist and Jain traditions, though not according to the *Purāṇas*,[4] Ajātasattu was succeeded by his son

1 See *Buddhist India*, ch. I; H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 3rd ed., p. 140. *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, p. 604.

2 In the *Vaṃsatthappakāsinī*, (p. 145), it is pointed out that Ajātasattu repaired the 18 great monasteries of Rājagaha.

3 *Mmk.*, p. 603:

शासनार्थं तु बुद्धानां कारयिष्यति चर्यं वी: ।
महाराजाजातविख्यातो मागधेयो नराधिपः ॥

4 Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

Udāyibhadda. He ruled for 16 years.[1] The *Mmk.* says that like his father he was not only enthusiastic about the religion but also had the sayings of Buddha collected.[2] In the same text[3] again, it is stated that the religion would decline after Buddha's death, the kings would be fighting with one another, and the monks would busy themselves with various secular matters, find fault of one another, and lack in self-restraint. The monks and men would be demoralised, indulge in false disputations, and become jealous of one another. The non-Buddhists would gain the upper hand and the people would revert to Brāhmanism and take to animal killing and such other evil practices. If this self-contradictory statement of the *Mmk.* be considered along with the discreet silence of the Ceylonese chronicles about the activities of Udāyibhadda, it seems that the cause of Buddhism found little favour with the king. The text adds that there would be, however, some good men, gods and beings other than human, who would continue to worship the relics, and though the religion would be on the wane, there

1 20 years according to the *Mmk.*, p. 604. Prof. Chattopadhyaya assigns to him a reigning period of 25 years.

Recently Prof. K. Chattopadhyaya has re-examined the question of succession of the kings of Magadha and arrived at the conclusion that *Darśaka* was an alternative name of Udāyi as *Śreṇika* was of Bimbisāra and *Kunika* of Ajātaśatru. (See *Proc. of the Indian History Congress*, Lahore, 1940, pp. 140-7). Prof. Bhandarkar identifies Darśaka with Nāgadāsaka. Cf. *Divyāvadāna*, p 369.

2 *Mmk.*, p. 604:—

तस्यापि सुतो राजा उकाराख्यः प्रकीर्त्तितः।
भविष्यति तदा चिप्रं शासनार्थं च उद्यतः॥
तदेतत् प्रवचनं शास्तु लिखापयिष्यति विस्तरम्।
पूजांश्च महतीं कृत्वा दिक समन्तान् नयिष्यति॥

3 *Mmk.*, p. 597-8.

would be a least eight distinguished monks[1] with Rāhula as the chief to protect the religion.

Buston[2] writes that the guardianship of the religion was entrusted by the Teacher to (Mahā) Kāśyapa, who in turn entrusted it to Ānanda. Both Kāśyapa and Ānanda passed away during the life-time of Ajātasattu. Ānanda charged his disciple Śāṇavāsika to protect the religion after his demise and to ordain, in course of time, Upagupta of Mathurā. He foretold that, according to the prophecy of the Teacher, Upagupta would become a Buddha but not with all the characteristics of a Sambuddha.

Just before his demise, Ānanda also ordained 500 Brāhmanical anchorites with Madhyāntika at their head, and entrusted him with the propagation of the religion in Kashmir. The episode of Madhyāntika and his activities in Kashmir do not find any mention in the Ceylonese chronicles.

ANURUDDHA'S SON MUṆḌA

Udāyibhadda, after a region of 16 years, was succeeded by his son Anuruddha whose period of reign along with that of his son Muṇḍa was very short, being only 8 years in all. In the *Divyāvadāna*[3] king Muṇḍa is described as the son of Udāyibhadda, and no mention is made of Anuruddha. In the

1 The list of monks given elsewhere is as follows:—

Mmk., p. 64: Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Subhūti, Rāhula, Nanda, Bhadrika, Kaphiṇa.

Ibid., p. 111: Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Gavāmpati, Piṇḍola-Bharadvāja, Pilindavatsa, Rāhula, Mahākāśyapa, Ānanda.

2 Obermiller's *Translation of Buston's History of Buddhism* (henceforth abbreviated as Buston), II, p. 88.

3 *Divyāvadāna*, p. 369.

Aṅguttara Nikāya,[1] king Muṇḍa is mentioned as approaching bhikkhu Nārada on the death of his queen Bhaddā. He listened to a discourse of bhikkhu Nārada delivered at Pāṭaliputta on the impermanence of worldly things. In the Jaina tradition preserved in the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* (ch. vi), it is stated that a prince in the guise of a Jaina novice killed Udāyin. Prof. Chattopadhyaya surmises that this novice might be king Muṇḍa.[2]

NĀGADĀSAKA

King Muṇḍa was succeeded by his son Nāgadāsaka, who ruled for 24 years. With Nāgadāsaka ended the rule of the line of kings that commenced with Bimbisāra.[3] In the Ceylonese chronicles, all the successors of Bimbisāra are described as patricidal (*pitughātakavaṃsa*); how far this statement is reliable remains yet to be examined, but it seems that the Buddhists were not in much favour of these kings, and evidently, as the *Mmk.* says, Buddhism was on the wane all along this period of about half a century. Madhyāntika's departure to Kashmir and his attempt to propagate Buddhism far away from Magadha is also an indirect hint to the unpopularity of the religion in the province of its origin.

1 *Aṅguttara,* III, pp. 57f.

2 K. Chattopadhyaya, *op. cit.*

3 The *Divyāvadāna* (p. 369) says that Muṇḍa's son was Kākavarṇi. In the *Aśokāvadāna* and *Divyāvadāna* the line of kings is given as follows: —

Bimbisāra-Ajātaśatru-Udāyibhadra-Muṇḍa-Kākavarṇi-Sahali-Tulakuci-Mahāmaṇḍala-Prasenajit-Nanda-Vindusāra-Susīma-Aśoka.

CHAPTER II

DISRUPTIVE FORCES IN THE BUDDHIST CHURCH

If the suttas in the Nikāyas and the rules in the Vinaya, the compilation of a greater portion of which may be placed during the reign of Ajātasattu and his successors, be scrutinised, it will be found that the disruptive forces were already at work within the Saṅgha even at the time of Ajātasattu, *i.e.*, soon after Buddha's death. These forces were not totally absent during the life-time of Buddha as is evidenced by the story of Kauśāmbī and the episode of Devadatta. In the Nikāyas[1] also appear a few apprehensive statements regarding the possibility of dissensions in the Saṅgha and the condemnation of *saṅghabbheda* as one of the five extreme offences like patricides, matricides and so forth. In the Vinaya, there are elaborate directions as to when a dissension among the monks should be regarded as a regular or an irregular *saṅghabbheda*. In the proceedings of the First Council also, is noticeable a rift in the lute in the refusal of Purāṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri to accept *in toto* the texts adopted by Mahākassapa and his followers as *Buddhavacana*. His insistence on the introduction of a few disciplinary rules clearly shows a lack of unanimity among the monks immediately after Buddha's death.[2]

1 *Majjhima*, III, p. 65; *Mahāvagga*, X. 3. 1; *Kathāvatthu*, XIII. 1

2 See my *Early Monastic Buddhism* (henceforth abbreviated as *EMB.*), I, p. 331-2.

The story of Kosambī

At Kosambī, there were two teachers, one a Dhammadhara and the other a Vinayadhara, both imparting instructions in their respective subjects to two different groups of students. One day the Dhammadhara teacher committed a very light offence through inadvertence and when pointed out he expressed regret for it, but this was talked about by the Vinayadhara teacher among his students and lay-devotees. The students and lay-admirers of the Dhammadhara teacher became offended at this provocative attitude of the Vinayadhara teacher and his followers, and there was a sharp cleavage not only between the two groups of students but also between their respective lay-devotees. Buddha intervened, and at first failed to make up the difference, and it was out of sheer disgust that he preferred to retire to the forest to be served by an elephant than by quarrelling people of the world. At this attitude of the Teacher, the quarrelling teachers, students and lay public came to their senses and settled their dispute.[1] This episode cannot strictly be called a *saṅghabheda*, but it shows the possibility of dissensions in the Saṅgha.

The episode of Devadatta

The episode of Devadatta is almost a *saṅghabheda* though it is not recognised as such in the Vinaya. Devadatta was an advocate for more austere discipline and requested the Teacher to make the following five rules compulsory for all monks[2]: —

1 *Mahāvagga*, X; *Majjhima*, Kosambisutta; *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, Kosambivattha. In the Gilgit ms. of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, the story remains substantially the same with slight variations in geographical details.

2 *Cullavagga*, vii. 3. 14; *Jātakas*, I, p. 34.

That the monks

(i) should live all their life in the forest;
(ii) subsist solely on doles collected out-doors;
(iii) dress themselves in rags picked out of dust-heaps;
(iv) dwell always under a tree and never under a roof;
(v) never eat fish or flesh.

Buddha could not agree with Devadatta. He believed more in person's own initiative than in obligatory rules, and so he left to the monks the option of observing the rules. This was too much for Devadatta, who departed to Gayāsīsa with a number of disciples who supported him. It is said that at the instance of Buddha, Sārīputta and Moggallāna later on won them over to Buddha's side.[1]

Apprehensive statements in the Nikāyas

Though Buddha did not admit that there was any dissension in his Saṅgha, he was fully conscious of the possibility of such dissensions. It is clear from his sayings here and there that he strongly apprehended dissensions among his followers. He laid stress upon the importance of *samaggā parisā* (concord in the saṅgha) and pointed out in one of his last discourses that so long as his disciples would perform the ecclesiastical functions in concord, the welfare of the Saṅgha was assured. Once Cunda and Ānanda approached him with the news of the death of Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta and informed him

1 Yuan Chwang writes that he saw three Buddhist monasteries at Karṇasuvarṇa, where, in accordance with the teaching of Devadatta, milk-products were not taken as food. Watters, II, pp. 191, 192. I-tsing states that milk is an unlawful food. See Takakusu, *I-tsing*, p. 43.

about the quarrels that immediately followed his death among his disciples. Buddha assured them that among his disciples there was no disagreement as far as his fundamental teaching, consisting of the 37 *Bodhipakkhiya dhammas*,[1] was concerned. There might be, after his death, he said, some differences of opinion relating to abhi-dhamma (*atireka-dhamma* = minor points of doctrine),[2] *ajjhājīva* (minor rules of livelihood) and *adhi-pātimokkha* (minor rules of discipline) but these should be treated as negligible (*appamattake*), but should there be any differences relating to the fruits (*magga*), path (*paṭipadā*) or the congregation (*saṅgha*), it would be a matter of regret and cause harm to the gods and the people.[3] In differences of minor matters, as mentioned above, his instruction was that the erring monks should be politely pointed out that they were putting a different interpretation on a text or misreading a text, and that in the interest of the Saṅgha, they should give it up; for practical purposes, he suggested, that a sane and reasonable member among the erring monks should be selected for the purpose.[4] In the *Saṅghādisesa* section of the *Pātimokkha* appear similar instructions (vide rules 10-11) with the addition that if the erring monk or monks do not change their views, he or they should be treated as guilty of the Saṅghādisesa offence. In the *Aṅguttara*[5] there is a reference to Ānanda complaining

1 Viz., (i) four *satipaṭṭhānas;* (ii) four *sammāppadhānas;* (iii) four *iddhipādas;* (iv) five *indriyas;* (v) five *balas;* (vi) seven *bojjhaṅgas;* (vii) eight-fold path. See *Dīgha*, xvi, 50; *Majjhima*, II, pp. 77, 103, 104; *Lalitavistara* (Bibl. Ind.), pp. 34-37; *Saṅgīti-paryāya* in *JPTS.*, 1904-5, pp. 71, 75.

2 *Atthasālini*, p. 2.

3 *Majjhima*, II, p. 245; cf. *Dīgha*, III, p. 117f.

4 *Majjhima*, II, pp. 238-9.

5 *Aṅguttara*, II, p. 239.

to Buddha that Anuruddha's disciple Bāhiyo was in the habit of picking up quarrels among the monks and causing dissension in the Saṅgha while his teacher would not say a word to him. Buddha pacified Ānanda by saying that Anuruddha had never interfered in Saṅgha matters, and that all such disputes had so far been settled by himself or Sāriputta and Moggallāna.

Failing to make up differences by polite persuasion, Buddha's instruction was to take resort to the seven methods of *adhikaraṇasamathas*, defined in the *Majjhima* and the *Pātimokkha*.[1] Buddha attributed all quarrels to selfish motives of the monks or their possession of certain wicked qualities. He held out the prospect of a happy and glorious life like that of the god Brahmā to a monk in after-life as the result of any act of his that would serve to re-unite the groups of monks separated from one another, while he declared that the monk sowing dissension among his brethren is doomed to perdition for an aeon.[2]

Definition of Saṅghabbheda

Every quarrel or difference of opinions among the bhikkhus was not characterised by Buddha as a *saṅghabbheda*. It is thus described in the *Vinaya:* "For not only is a formal putting forward and voting on the false doctrine essential to schism as distinct from mere disagreement, but the offending bhikkhus must also be quite aware that the doctrine so put forth is wrong, or at least doubtful, and also that the schism resulting from his action will be or will probably be disastrous to the Dhamma. In other words, the schism must be brought about deliberately by putting forward a doctrine known to be false, or at least doubtful, or with the express intention or object of thereby injuring the

1 See *EMB.*, I, p. 307-8.

2 *Aṅguttara,* V, pp. 73, 75, 78; *Cullavagga*, vii. 5.

Dhamma."[1] This definition obviously represents the opinion of the conservative school of the Theravādins who usually looked upon all those who differed from them with an eye of suspicion and ascribed an evil motive to their entertainment of the dissenting views. It is very likely that the dissenters held an honest belief that their views were devoid of any evil motive of injuring the Dhamma. It will, therefore, be apparent from a neutral standpoint that evil intention is not an essential factor of the *saṅghabbheda*. The real essentials are:— (1) belief in a dissentient religious view regarding either one or more points of faith or discipline; (2) entertainment of the dissenting view by eight, or more than eight, fully ordained monks; (3) the division taken among the aforesaid eight or more monks must show a majority on the side of the dissenters. When the disunion is confined to eight monks, it is called *Saṅgharāji*. This restriction as to number forming the essential of *saṅgharāji* shows that it might at any moment develop into a *saṅghabbheda*, by drawing an additional monk into the difference. Of course, *bonafide* belief and the full ordination of monks are necessary requisites.[2]

Differences in the First Council Proceedings

In the proceedings of the First Council it will be observed that Mahākassapa was keen on securing the approval of all the senior monks, particularly, of Gavampati and Purāṇa, of the

1 *Vinaya Texts* (*S. B. E.*), pt. iii, p. 271 n.

2 *Cullavagga*, vii, 5, 1; *Milindapañha*, p. 108: "No layman can create a schism, nor a sister of the order, no one under preparatory instruction, nor a novice of either sex. It must be a bhikkhu under no disability, who is in full communion and co-resident" (*S. B. E.*, vol. xxxv, p. 163).

texts settled by his Council as *Buddhavacana.*[1] Gavampati remained neutral, i.e., he did not wholeheartedly accepted the proceedings of the Council as final while Purāṇa expressed his inability to accept the same as the words of the Teacher.[2] He further insisted on the incorporation into the Vinaya of eight rules relating to food.[3] The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya not only upheld these eight rules as pointed out by Prof. Przyluski[4] and also gave special recognition to Purāṇa as one of the foremost teachers of the time.

All these testimonies clearly indicate that the seeds of dissensions had already been sown in the Saṅgha during Buddha's life-time and that these sprouted forth in full vigour in the second century after Buddha's demise.[5]

1 See *EMB.*, I, p. 331-2.

2 *Cullavagga,* xi. 1. 11.

3 The eight rules (as translated by Suzuki from Chinese) are:—(i) cooking food indoors; (ii) cooking indoors; (iii) cooking of one' own accord; (iv) taking food of one's own accord; (v) receiving food when rising early in the morning; (vi) carrying food home in compliance with the wish of the giver; (vii) having miscellaneous fruits; and (viii) eating things grown in a pond.

4 Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha.*

5 See *Infra,* Ch. VII.

CHAPTER III

PROBABLE CAUSES FOR DISSENSIONS IN THE SAṄGHA

In the preceding chapter, it has been shown that disruptive forces were already at work within the Saṅgha during and immediately after Buddha's life-time. On scrutinizing these and the state of the Buddhist church as presented in the Nikāyas and the Vinaya, we may point out the following as the probable causes for dissensions in the Saṅgha:—

Absence of the supreme head of the church

Buddha thought that the prescription of heavy punishments for schisms in the church would check them effectively and that his Dhamma and Vinaya were comprehensive enough to keep intact the religion established by him, obviating thereby the appointment of the supreme religious head. He magnified the unaided strength of *dhamma* and *vinaya*, and directed that his teachings would be the Teacher after his death.[2] Vassakāra asked Ānanda whether any bhikkhu had been specified by Buddha as would after his death become the leader of men under whom everybody would seek shelter. Ānanda answered in the negative. He asked again whether any bhikkhu had been selected by the *Saṅgha* as would become their leader etc. To this also Ānanda answered in the negative. Vassakāra was curious to learn the cause of the concord prevail-

1 *Majjhima*, II, p. 105.

2 *Dīgha*, II, p. 154: *Yo mayā dhamma ca vinayo ca desito paññatto, so vo mam' accayena Satthā.*

ing in the church inspite of there being no leader (lit. refuge). Ānanda replied "We are not without a refuge (*appaṭisaraṇā*), *dhamma* is our refuge. There is a treatise called *Pātimokkha* which has been formulated by the omniscient Teacher and which all the monks living in the same parish (*gāmakkhetta*) have to recite in a monastery where they assemble on the *uposatha* days. Should there occur any difference or doubt in the recitation, the bhikkhus present explain them in accordance with the *dhamma* (hence they have their refuge as *dhamma*)."[1] In answer to another question put by Vassakāra, Ānanda explained that though there was no supreme head of the fraternity but there was in each parish a qualified head who was respected by the people under his charge and whose guidance was strong enough to keep the great many parishes connected together in religious concord. This conversation makes it clear that each parish was under the control of the seniormost and the best qualified monk that the parish could furnish.[2]

In the Pātimokkha assemblies, the monks interpreted the terse expressions of the Teacher in different ways and intro-

1 *Majjhima*, III, pp. 7ff.

2 In the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* (*Dīgha*, II, p. 77) it is enjoined upon the bhikkhus that they should offer due respect to the *Saṅgha-pitara* or *Saṅgha-parināyaka* (the head of the parish) who should be bhikkhus of long standing and experience for the well-being of this Saṅgha. See also *Aṅguttara*, IV, p. 21; V, p. 353.

Childers in his *Pāli-Dictionary* (s. v. saṅgha) says that a *Saṅghatthera* is usually selected as the President of an assembly. He cites, for instance, Kassapa, the then Saṅghatthera was the President of the First Council. He also points out that a Saṅghatthera is not always the one who is the longest ordained for Sabbakāmin who was the longest *upasampanna* bhikkhu was not the President of the Second Council.

duced additional material in the interpretations, and passed them in the name of Buddha. This happened in most of the parishes scattered over the whole of northern India. There was none at that time in the whole of the Buddhist community who could dissolve the numberless divergences thus originated into one uniform whole and convert the threatening centrifugal forces then at work into centripetal, conducive to the well-being of the whole Saṅgha.

Mahākassapa made an attempt to remedy this defect of the Saṅgha as a whole by convening a Council, but he was also not fully successful as pointed out above (p. 10-11).

System of specialisation in different branches of Buddhist literature

The Pali literature is replete with terms like (i) *Suttantikas* or masters of Suttanta (or the Sutta-piṭaka); (ii) *Vinayadharas* or repositories of the rules of discipline (Vinaya-piṭaka); (iii) *Mātikādharas* or those versed in *mātikā* (=*abhidhamma*); (iv) *Dhammakathikas* or the preachers of the Buddhist doctrine.[1] In the Aṭṭhakathās again, appear further terms like *Dīgha-bhāṇaka* and *Majjhima-bhāṇaka* (reciters of the *Dīgha* and *Majjhima Nikāyas*).[2]

In those days, when writing was hardly used for putting on record the sayings and discourses of Buddha, the means for preserving and handing them down to posterity was recitation and memorization. This was akin to the method that had been in vogue in India from the earliest Vedic period, which also gave rise to the different Vedic schools. A similar cause produced a

1 *Dīgha*, II, p. 125; *Aṅguttara*, I. p. 117.

2 *Sum. Vil.*, I, p. 15; *Papañcasūdanī*, p. 79.

similar result among the Buddhists and we find that the memorizing of different portions of the Piṭaka was entrusted to different sets of bodies hardened and separated from one another in course of time and bearing names descriptive of their functions.[1]

In the account of the first Council it will be observed that Ānanda was requested to recite the *Suttas* while Upāli the *Vinaya*. This would not have been the case if Ānanda or Upāli was not generally famed for proficiency in the particular branches of the Piṭaka. Elements of such specialisation can be noticed in the quarrel that took place between the *dhammakathikas* and the *vinayadharas*.[2] Commonness of duties gave rise to unity among the *dhammakathikas* on one side and the *vinayadharas* on the other in such a marked way that each group made the cause of one individual member its common cause and participated in the dispute.

It is an interesting reading how arrangements of beds and seats were made for the residence of the bhikkhus.[3] Dabba Mallaputta, it is said, made such an arrangement that the bhikkhus, adopting the same mode of life (*sabhāgā*), resided in the same place in order that the *Suttantikas* could recite *suttantas* among themselves while the *Vinayadharas* could discuss the

1 *Vinaya*, IV. 15. 4. (*S. B. E.* xiii, p. 339). "On the Pavāraṇā day the greater part of the night has passed away while the bhikkhus were in confusion: the bhikkhus were reciting the Dhamma, those versed in Suttantas were propounding the Suttantas, those versed in Vinaya were discussing the Vinaya, the Dhamma preachers were talking about the Dhamma".

In the *Sum. Vil.*, I, p. 15, it is stated that the memorization of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, *Saṃyutta-nikāya* and *Aṅguttara-nikāya* was entrusted to Sāriputta, Mahākassapa and Anuruddha respectively and their respective disciples.

2 See above, p. 6.

3 *Vinaya*, II, pp. 75, 76.

rules of discipline with one another, and the *Dhammakathikas* talk about the matters of doctrine. Instances are not rare of a feeling of rivalry among these bodies, each member of which wished and was pleased to see the body to which he belonged take precedence over other bodies in having seat or food in assemblies or in thanksgiving after a meal.[1]

These separate bodies, which existed for a particular function necessary for the whole Buddhist community, e.g., the preservation of a particular portion of the Piṭaka by regular recitations, imbibed in course of time, doctrines, which could be looked upon as peculiar to the body holding them and in this way, the body developed into a separate religious school of Buddhism. Such instances are found in the Theravādins who had developed into such a school from the *Vinayadharas*, and the Sautrāntikas from the *Suttantas*.

The crystallization of bodies happened not only for the preservation of literature but also for the grouping of monks around a noted teacher. Buddha awarded prominence to some of his disciples by extolling them for their attainment of proficiency in certain branches of the Buddhist dhamma.[2] Of them the following may be mentioned:—(i) Sāriputta, the foremost of the highly wise (*mahāpaññānam*); (ii) Mahāmoggallāna, the foremost of the possessors of miraculous powers (*iddhimantānam*); (iii) Anuruddha, the foremost of the possessors of divine eyes (*dibba-cakkhukānam*); (iv) Mahākassapa, the foremost of the followers of *dhūta* precepts (*dhūtavādānam*); (v) Puṇṇa Mantāniputta, the foremost of the preachers of *dhamma* (*dhammakathikānam*); (vi) Mahākaccāyana, the foremost of the expositors

1 *Cullavagga*, IV, 6, 2; *Mahāvagga*, IV, 15, 4.

2 *Aṅguttara*, I, p. 24.

(*saṅkhittena bhāsitassa vitthārena atthaṃ vibhajantānam*); (vii) Rāhula, the foremost of the students (*sikkhākāmānam*); (viii) Revata Khadiravaniya, the foremost of the forest-recluses (*āraññikānam*); (ix) Ānanda, the foremost of the vastly learned (*bahussutānam*), and (x) Upāli, the foremost of the masters of Vinaya (*vinayadharānam*).

Buddha indirectly pointed out to his new disciples the preceptor most suited to each in view of his peculiar mental leanings. This practice led to the grouping of students around a teacher or his direct disciples, hence the remark *dhātuso sattā saṃsandanti samenti*[1] on the principle that like draws like. In the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*,[2] we read of ten chief theras, viz. Sāriputta, Moggallāna, Mahākoṭṭhita, etc., each having ten to forty disciples under their tution. Buddha on a certain occasion pointed out that the group of bhikkhus formed round each of these *theras* was possessed of the same special qualifications that characterised the *thera* himself. Thus the bhikkhus accompanying Sāriputta were *mahāpaññāvantā*, those accompanying Mahāmoggallāna were *mahiddhikā*, those accompanying Mahākassapa were *dhūtavādā*, those accompanying Devadatta were sinfully inclined (*pāpicchā*).

Yuan Chwang noticed about a thousand years later that on auspicious days the Abhidhammikas worshipped Śārīputra, the Vinayists Upāli, the Śrāmaṇeras Rāhula, the Sūtraists Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra, the Samādhists Mahāmoggallāna, the bhikkhuṇīs Ānanda, the Mahāyānists Mañjuśrī and other Bodhisattvas.[3]

In the first four classes of bhikkhus, the aforesaid affinity between them and their leaders is obvious. In the next three

1 *Saṃyutta*, II, p. 157. 2 *Saṃyutta*, II, pp. 155, 156.

3 Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, I, p. 302.

classes, the affinity existed all the same though it may not be apparent on the face of it. For the Samādhists followed Mahāmoggallāna because he was the master of *iddhi par excellence* which could be obtained only through *samādhi,* and the bhikkhuṇīs followed Ānanda because to him the order of nuns owed its origin.

The principal points of resemblance between the followers and their preceptors were the ties that bound them together but these were the points which constituted the features by which the chief qualities of the preceptors were distinguished. These distinctions among them did not lie in any differences of doctrines which they professed but in the degrees of proficiency attained by each, in particular directions of Buddhistic *sādhana.* But the divisions though not proceeding from radical differences in doctrine grew stereotyped in course of time, and fusion between them later on became an impossibility due to the separatist frame of mind that their existence as separate bodies naturally developed. Thus the division which had commenced without any doctrinal differences gradually gave rise to the latter and grew into full-fledged schools.

Latitude allowed in discipline

It has been already mentioned in connection with the episode of Devadatta[1] that Buddha allowed a certain amount of latitude to his disciples in the observance of Vinaya rules. He laid more emphasis on mental than on physical discipline. In his discussion with Upāli, a disciple of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta, he pointed out that he considered *manodaṇḍa* as more important

1 See above, p. 6-7.

than *kāyadaṇḍa* in spiritual culture.[1] In the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta,* his direction regarding the abrogation of minor disciplinary rules clearly revealed his viewpoint in regard to external discipline.[2] In short, in his estimation, *paññā* and *citta* practices were far more important than *sīla* observance.[3] He realised the value of the latter for the new adepts but it was not the all and end all of his scheme of culture. From the history of the growth of the Vinaya code[4] it will be observed how he made concessions after concessions for the physical comforts of his disciples. His code was not a hard and fast one. He made exceptions in favour of the bhikkhus who were placed at a disadvantage by reason of the locality in which they resided. In the border countries (*paccantima janapada*) such as Avantī, the converts were few and intractable, hence, Buddha at the request of Kaccāyana and Puṇṇa Mantānīputta made some exceptions in their favour in regard to the rules for the formation of an assembly for ordaining monks, and the use of leather-made shoes and other articles, prohibited to the bhikkhus dwelling in the Middle country.[5]

Particularly noticeable is his reply to the Vajjiputtaka monk who expressed his difficulty in observing all the 250 rules of the *Pātimokkha.* Buddha said that he would be satisfied if the bhikkhu would practise the three Śikṣās,[6] viz., *adhisīla,*

1 *Majjhima,* I, p. 372f. 2 *Dīgha,* II, p. 154.

3 See *EMB.,* I, ch. XII. 4 *EMB.,* I, ch. XVI.

5 For boundaries, see B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism; Vinaya,* I, pp. 197-8; *Divyāvadāna,* p. 21.

6 *Majjhima,* II, pp. 8, 9. Cf. *DhA.,* I, p. 334: 'Sekho' ti adhisīlasikkhā adhicittasikkhā adhipaññāsikkhā ti imā tisso sikkhā sikkhaṇato sotāpattimaggaṭṭhaṃ ādiṃ katvā yāva arahattamaggaṭṭhā sattavidho sekho......

adhicitta and *adhipaññā*, by which he meant the minute observance of the discipline envisaged in the *aṭṭhaṅka-magga*.

Austerities made optional

From his personal experiences Buddha recommended to his disciples the middle path which eschewed austerities as a means of attaining the goal. Buddha himself led a life of severe austerity and he was convinced that such austerities could never fulfil his mission.[1] For this reason one is expected that austere practices should not figure in his disciplinary code and this is actually a fact,[2] but there are ample evidences to show that Buddha praised those ascetics who took to the *dhūta* precepts.[3] Buddha yielded to the strong tendency of those disciples who believed in the efficacy of austerities and could not be satisfied with a religion barren of such practices. Mahākassapa, one of his most favourite disciples, was an advocate of austerities, and it was difficult for the Teacher not to comply with the wishes of disciples like him. The system of living a forest-life, therefore, came into vogue in the early days of Buddhism and so there are in the Vinaya special rules for the *āraññakas*. The *āraññakas* were required to attend the fortnightly *Pātimokkha* assemblies, but they were exempted from many formalities.

(v) *Faith instead of moral practices*

It cannot be exactly determined when firm faith in *Buddha*, *Dhamma* and *Saṅgha* came to be recognised as a means to the attainment of Nirvāṇa. In the *Vatthūpamasutta*, so much emphasis is laid on it, that a monk having firm faith in the

1 *Majjhima*, I, p. 17. 2 *Vinaya*, V, 131, 193.
3 *Aṅguttara*, III, p. 344f.

Triratna is exempted from observing even the rules of food. This *sutta* further shows that a monk taking to faith need not practise the *sīlas* as recommended for the generality of monks.[1]

In view of what has been stated above, we may conclude that strict observance of the Vinaya rules was not in the Teacher's mind though after his demise his disciples made the most of same. In fact, they became more and more ritualistic and failed in using common discretion. A slight deviation from the Vinaya laws made them sinners though it mattered very little in spiritual advancement. The protest raised by the Mahāsaṅghikas had nothing untoward in it and the Theravādins, we may say, magnified them. We do not mean to justify laxity in discipline but when discipline ends in literal and superficial observance of a set of rules, one has the right to examine them on merits.

1. See my paper in *IHQ.*, vol. XVI: *Place of Faith in Early Buddhism.*

CHAPTER IV

FROM KĀLĀSOKA TO NANDA

The Bimbisāra (or Haryaṅka) line of kings ended with the reign of king Nāgadāsaka.[1] The throne was taken by his minister Susunāga, who according to the traditions preserved in the *Uttaravihāra Aṭṭhakathā*, was the son of a Licchavi prince of Vesāli by a courtezan.[2] As he was adopted by a minister, he came to be known as a minister's son. According to a late tradition preserved in the *Mālālaṅkāravatthu*, Susunāga had his royal residence at Vesāli, to which place he later on transferred the capital from Rājagaha. He ruled for 18 years and is said to have humbled the Pradyota dynasty of Avantī.[3] As far as the testimony of the Buddhist texts is concerned, no incident of note happened during his reign in the history of Buddhism.

Susunāga was succeeded by his son Kālāsoka of the Ceylonese chronicles or Kākavarṇi of the *Purāṇas*. Most of the scholars are of opinion that the two names are of an identical person. The *Aśokāvadāna* places Kākavarṇi after Muṇḍa[4] and makes no mention of Kālāsoka while the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* speaks of Viśoka as the successor of Susunāga. Tāranātha has made a confusion of the Emperor Aśoka with Kālāsoka and makes Viśoka a son of Aśoka. In the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* (p. 2) he is called simply Aśoka. The outstanding event that

1 See above, p. 4.

2 *Vaṃsaṭṭhappakāsini*, I, p. 155.

3 See Raychaudhury, *Political History*, (1932), p. 147.

4 See above, p. 3-4.

took place in the history of Buddhism during his reign is the session of the Second Buddhist Council (see *infra*).

According to the *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, Kālāsoka was succeeded by his ten sons: Bhadrasena, Koraṇḍavarṇa, Maṅgura, Sabbañjaha, Jālaka, Ubhaka, Sañjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana, and Pañcamaka, who ruled simultaneously for 22 years. This tradition, however, is not corroborated by other Buddhist sources, according to which Kālāsoka or Viśoka was succeeded by his son Śūrasena, who reigned for 17 years.[1]

Śūrasena supported the bhikṣus of the four quarters for three years, and offered a hundred kinds of requisites to all *caityas* existing on the face of the earth.[2] Tāranātha makes Arhat Śāṇavāsika and Arhat Yaśa contemporaries of Śūrasena and refers to the appearance of Mahādeva and his five propositions during his reign.

Śūrasena was succeeded by Nanda, who, according to Tāranātha,[3] was Śūrasena's son. The *Mmk.*[4] says that king Nanda was very powerful, maintained a large army and made Puṣpapura his capital. He, it is said, acquired wealth through magical means. Jayaswal[5] on the basis of the stanza in the *Mmk.*:

1 Also called Ugrasena in the *Mahābodhi-vaṃsa*. Cf. *Mmk.*, p. 611: तस्याप्यनन्तरे राजा शूरसेनः प्रकाश्यते ।

2 Schiefner *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus*, p. 50-51, The restoration from Tibetan may well be Śūrasena instead of Virasena. Cf. *Mmk.* p. 611:

तेनापि कारिता शास्तुः कारा सुमहती तदा ।
स्तूपैरलंकृता सर्वा समुद्रान्ता वसुन्धरा ॥

3 Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 52. King Nanda came of the Licchavi tribe, see p. 41.

4 *Mmk.*, p. 611-612. 5 *Imperial History of India*, p. 14.

नीचमुख्यसमाख्यातो ततो लोके भविष्यति ।
तद्धनं प्राप्य मन्त्री सौ लोके पार्थिवतां गतः ॥

remarks that Nanda was at first a minister of the previous king and that he belonged to a low family but was the leading man of the community. By unexpected acquisition of wealth he became the king of the country. He entertained the bhikṣus in Kāśī for many years.[1] King Nanda was surrounded by Brāhmaṇa ministers, on whom also he bestowed wealth. At the instance of his spiritual teacher (*kalyāṇamitra*) he offered several gifts to the *caityas* built on Buddha's relics.[2] King Nanda ruled for 20 years and died as a true Buddhist at the age of sixty-six.[3]

During the reign of Nanda, the bhikṣu Nāga began to speak highly of the five propositions of Mahādeva, which led to the appearance of four schools.[4] In this connection, we may refer to the statement of Tāranātha that during the reign of Aśoka (i.e. Kālāsoka) appeared a brāhmaṇa Vatsa in Kashmir who was learned but very wicked. He took pleasure in preaching the Ātmaka theory, travelled over all the countries and turned the simple people into his own teaching and caused a dissension in the Saṅgha.[5] It is a well known fact that the Vātsiputrīyas were one of the four schools, and probably this school came into existence at an earlier date but was recognised as a separate school at the time of king Nanda.

Tāranātha as well as Bu-ston speak of the successor of Nanda as his son Mahāpadma, who, they state, was devoted to Buddhism and furnished the monks at Kusumapura with all their necessaries of life.[6] They further state that Vararuci and

1 Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
2 *Mmk.*, p. 611-2.
3 *Mmk.*, p. 612.
4 Schiefner, *op. cit.*
5 *Ibid.*
6 Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

Pāṇini, who were his father's ministers, continued to be his ministers, but Vararuci was hated and ultimately killed by him. As an atonement for the sin of killing a brāhmaṇa, 24 monasteries were erected by him. During his reign, Tāranātha states, Sthiramati, a disciple of Nāga,[1] caused further divisions in the Saṅgha by propagating his teacher's propositions.

Prof. Raichaudhury and other scholars place king Nanda after the reign of the sons of Kālāsoka, Jayaswal, on the basis of the *Mmk.*, places Śūrasena after Kālāsoka. It may be that Śūrasena was another name of Bhadrasena, the first son of Kālāsoka. In the history of Buddhism we know that, after the session of the second council during the reign of Kālāsoka, dissensions arose in the Buddhist Saṅgha. Mahādeva's five propositions were regarded by Vasumitra and others as one of the causes of the dissensions. Mahādeva was followed by Nāga, who, in his turn, was followed by Sthiramati in the propagation of the five propositions. In view of this succession of teachers, it is quite probable that Kālāsoka was succeeded by Śūrasena, and Śūrasena by Nanda. Buston writes that troubles arose in the Buddhist Saṅgha 137 years after Buddha's *parinibbāna.*[2] This date coincides with the reign of Nanda and therefore his information as also of Tāranātha that Śūrasena intervened between Kālāsoka and Nanda appears to be historical. It is quite likely that the Tibetan historians mistook the name Mahāpadma Nanda as names of two personages. Nanda and Mahāpadma, and made the latter a son of the former. It may be that king Nanda took the appellation Mahāpadma some time after the commencement of his reign.

1 See above, p. 24.
2 Buston, II, p. 76.

The *Mmk.* and the Tibetan historians furnish us with interesting information regarding the time and activities of the famous grammarians Pāṇini and Vararuci. Regarding Pāṇini the texts mention that he was born at Bhīrukavana in the west (probably north-west) and that though he was a brāhmaṇa, he was strongly inclined to the Buddhist faith, and that he attained proficiency in grammar (*śabdaśāstra*) through the grace of Avalokiteśvara. He composed the well-known *Pāṇinivyākaraṇa* and ultimately attained *Śrāvakabodhi*. The date of Pāṇini is placed by Weber, Maxmüller, Keith, and several other scholars between 350 and 300 B.C., and this is also the time of the reigning period of king Nanda, hence the contemporaneity of Nanda and Pāṇini as stated by the Buddhist writers seems to be true.

Regarding Vararuci our information is that he was an erudite scholar and started writing explanatory *śāstras* on Buddha's words. Prof. Belvalkar[1] has adduced ample evidences to show that Vararuci was another name of Kātyāyana of the Aindra School of grammarians, which school, Tāranātha says, was believed to be earlier than the Pāṇinian school. To this school also belongs Kaccāyana's Pāli grammar. Vararuci's interest in writing exegetical literature is also referred to by Belvalkar.[2] In view of all these, it will not be wide of the mark if we hold that Vararuci was also a contemporary of king Nanda and Pāṇini and that he like his famous namesake Mahākaccāyana specialised in writing commentaries on Buddha's enigmatic expressions. Tāranātha suggests that the writing of *Vibhāṣā-śāstras* was commenced by Vararuci. It may be that Kātyāyana or Vararuci

1 *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, pp. 11, 27, 85.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 84.

was the originator of the Sarvāstivāda school of Buddhism, which later on came to be known as the Vaibhāṣika school. From the above account, we may conclude that dissensions in the Buddhist Saṅgha commenced in the reign of Kālāsoka and multiplied during the reigns of Śūrasena and Mahāpadma Nanda.

Principal centres of Buddhism

The names of monks and the geographical information as furnished by the accounts of the Second Council throw interesting light on the extent of the area which came under the influence of the Buddhist church. The leading monks of the time were counted as eight, viz., Sabbakāmī, Sāḷha, Revata, Khujjasobhita, Yasa, Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī, Vāsabhagāmika and Sumana.[1] The first six were disciples of Ānanda, and the remaining two of Anuruddha. Ānanda died during the latter part of the reign of Ajātasattu, and so the age of his disciples at the time of the Second Council exceeded, in any case, 90 years. Sabbakāmī was then the Saṅghatthera but Revata was the recognised leader. In the Sanskrit tradition, Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī gets more prominence as he, according to this tradition, was selected by Ānanda as the monk to take charge of the religion after him. In the Chinese traditions, he is shown as taking the leading part in the deliberations of the Council. The Vesālians were monks of the eastern countries (*pācīnakā*) so also were Sabbakāmī, Sāḷha of Sahajāti,[2] Khujjasobhita and Vāsabha-

1 Buston (II, p. 93) gives a slightly different list: Yaśas, Sāḍha, Dhanika, Kubjita, Ajita, Sambhūta, Revata.

2 Soṇaka, according to Buston, II, p. 93. Sahajāti is identified with Bhiṭā 9 miles S.S.W. from Allahabad. Sir John Marshall identifies Sahajāti with Bhiṭa on the basis of the inscription: 'Māgadhi Śahajātiye nigamaśa'. See N. N. Ghosh, *Early His. of Kausambi*, p. 89.

gāmika.[1] In Buston's account, Sabbakāmī is said to have been residing at Vesāli. Hiuen Tsang tells us that Khujjasobhita belonged to Pāṭaliputra while Sāḷha came from Vesāli. It will be observed that Sāḷha of Sahajāti or Vesāli was at first in an indecisive mood. King Kālāsoka also like Sāḷha was at first in favour of the Vesālians, but later on, at the intervention of his sister Bhikkhunī Nandā, he changed towards the Westerners. In the early history of Buddhism, Vesāli is described as a town seething with non-Buddhsitic thinkers and as a centre of the followers of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta, hence it is quite in keeping with the traditions of the country that non-orthodox Buddhists should find a footing there.

Yasa, the most active figure in the account and the one who started the commotion, hailed, according to Hiuen Tsang, from Kosala. He left Vesāli for Kosambī, where he organised a party with sixty monks of Pāvā (Pāveyyakā)[2] and eighty monks of Avantī, all of the Western countries.[3] He proceeded with them first to Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī of Mathurā and met him at Ahogaṅga.[4] Accompanied by him they went to meet Revata, another Westerner, belonging to Kanauj and met him at

Buston (p. 93) gives the following geographical information:—

i Sarvakāmin of Vaiśālī — ii Yaśas of Dhanika
iii Sāḍha of Soṇaka
iv Dhanika of Saṃkāsya (in Magadha, see Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagaha*, p. 286)
v Kubjita of Pāṭaliputra — vi Ajita of Śrughna
vii Sambhūta of Mahiṣmati — viii Revata of Sahajāti.

2 Pāṭheyyakā is another reading.

3 *Vaṃsatthappakāsinī*, p. 166: Pacchimikā yeva Pāveyyakā.

4 Ahogaṅgā is a mountain near the sources of the Ganges. Moggaliputta Tissa resided there immediately before the Third Council see B. C. Law; *Geog. of Early Buddhism*, p. 40.

Soreyya. The fourth Western monk was Sumana. Thus we see that there was a clear geographical division among the monks. The opposition to the Vesālian practices was started by Yasa of Kosala,[1] and supported by Revata of Soreyya (Kanauj),[2] Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī of Mathurā, and Sumana, whose native place is not mentioned anywhere. This testifies to the fact that the monks of the Western countries, viz. Kauśāmbī,[3] Avantī Mathurā were more orthodox in their observance of the Vinaya rules as adopted by the Theravādins. In the deliberations of the Council, Sabbakāmī, though the Saṅghatthera, was not given the lead, and this also proves the lack of his whole-hearted support to the agitation started by Yasa. Sāḷha's attitude, as mentioned above, was at first indecisive and similar probably was also the view of Khujjasobhita of Pāṭaliputra.

Prof. Przyluski also has noted the geographical division of monks in his *Concile de Rājagṛha* (p. 308-9) and remarks that there were definitely three centres, viz., Vaiśālī,[4] Kauśāmbī and Mathurā. Kauśāmbī and all south-western countries became later on the seat of the Theravādins while Mathurā and the north-western countries of the Sarvāstivādins. The Westerners of this Council were therefore the group of monks who came to be later on known as the Sthaviras and Sarvāstivādins while the Easterners, who made their seat at Vaiśālī, were the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots. Whatever may have been the differences

1 Dhanika, according to Buston (II, p. 91).

2 Kauśāmbī is identified with the ruins at Kośam, 38 miles from Allahabad above the Yamunā. Watters, II, p. 75.

3 In the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya account of the Kauśāmbī dispute, one party is described as Vesālian and the other Kauśāmbian.

4 Vaiśālī is identified with Besarh in the Muzaffarpur district of Behar.

between the Easterners and Westerners, it is apparent that Buddhism was prevalent at the time all over the central belt of India from Avantī[1] to Vaiśālī and from Mathurā to Kauśāmbī. The chief centre of Buddhism, it seems, was shifted at that time from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra which became then also the royal seat of the rulers. The Mahāsaṅghikas made Pāṭaliputra their chief centre.[2]

1 Avantī in ancient times was divided into two parts, the northern part with its capital at Ujjeni is identified with Malwa.

2 See *Infra*

CHAPTER V

SECOND BUDDHIST COUNCIL

Sources (Earlier): (i) Our main sources of information for the history of the Second Council are the *Cullavagga* of the Vinaya Piṭaka and the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu,* the Tibetan translation of the *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya,*[1] which forms also the basis of Buston's and Tāranātha's accounts of the Council, as also of Rockhill. The Ceylonese chronicles and Pāli commentaries derive their information mainly from the *Cullavagga* and so have no independent value of their own. The account of Yuan Chwang is useful inasmuch as his information is derived from the Chinese versions of the Vinaya texts of the Mahāsaṅghika and other schools.

Sources (Later): (ii) Besides the above accounts derived from the Vinaya texts, there are three other texts written by Bhavya, Vasumitra and Vinītadeva on the history of the Buddhist schools. In introducing the history of the schools of thought, Vasumitra refers to the Council. He writes that it was held one hundred and odd years after Buddha's death while Aśoka was ruling at Kusumapura[2] in Magadha kingdom. Evidently, by

1 *Dul-va,* xi, 323-330; Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha,* pp. 171-180. The account also appears in the Vinaya texts of the Mahīśāsakas and the Dharmaguptas. Tāranātha, p. 41; Bu-ston, p. 91f.

2 See Masuda in *Asia Major,* I, p. 14. According to some authorities the name of the kings is given as Nanda and Mahāpadma and the time elapsed after Buddha's death is 137 years. See Bu-ston, II, p. 96.

Aśoka, he meant Kālāśoka of the Pāli tradition. All these three writers have not a word to say about the ten un-Vinayic acts of the Mahāsaṅghikas. They attribute the division of the Saṅgha to the five propositions of Mahādeva.[1] The works of these writers, therefore, are not of much value for the events that led to the session of the Second Council.

(iii) Apart from the two kinds of sources mentioned above, there are references to the session of the Council in the *Mahāvastu, Samādhirāja, Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* and other later texts, hence the session of the Council was taken generally as an accepted fact by the early writers on Buddhism.

The Story

Some of the Vajjian monks of Vesāli allowed as lawful ten rules which were not in strict conformity with the *Pātimokkha*. Yasa of Kosambi, while at Vesāli, happened to notice this and strongly protested against the same. The Vajjian monks resented this attitude of Yasa and expelled him (*ukkhepana*) from the Saṅgha. Yasa made an appeal to the laity of Vesāli, and it is said, that he had to flee to his native land. From there he tried to form a party of monks who adhered to his views. He sent messengers to the monks at Pāṭheyya and Avantī, and he himself went to Ahogaṅga, the residence of Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī. There he was joined by sixty theras of Pāṭheyya and eighty theras of Avantī, and gradually by several others. They all decided to approach Revata of Soreyya, who was then the chief of the Saṅgha. Before they could reach Soreyya, Revata started for Vesāli, and the meeting of Revata with other monks took place at Sahajāti. The Vajjian monks, in order to forestall

1 *Infra*, p. 41.

Yasa's plans, approached Revata at Sahajāti with robes and such other presents but failed to win him over to their side. Sāḷha of Sahajāti was at first wavering between the two parties, but ultimately he sided with Yasa. The Vajjian monks, being unsuccessful in this attempt of theirs, approached king Kālāsoka at Pupphapura, and persuaded him to believe that the monks of the western countries were making a sinister move to get possession of the Teacher's Gandhakūṭī in the Mahāvanavihāra at Vesāli. The king at first took up their cause but later on changed his mind, it is said, at the intervention of his sister who was a *bhikkhuṇī*. The session of the Council was held at Vesāli with 700 members but as there was great uproar during the deliberations of the Council, it was decided to refer the matters to a body of referees consisting of eight members, four from the orthodox party of the west and four from the unorthodox party of the east. The Council followed the *Ubbāhikā* process as described in the *Pātimokkha*.[1] The findings of the referees, which were all against the Vesālian monks, were placed before the larger body constituting the Council and were confirmed.

The Ceylonese chronicles continue the story and write that the findings were not accepted by all the Vesālian monks, some of whom held another Council and included in it all the monks whether arhats and non-arhats, and decided matters according to their own light. This assembly was called Mahāsaṅgha or Mahāsaṅgīti.

Time & site of the Council

All the traditions state that a Council was held about a century after Buddha's death to suppress certain un-Vinayic acts

1 See *Early Monastic Buddhism*, vol. I, p. 319.

practised by a group of monks of Vesāli. The Council was held at Vesāli, but the traditions differ about the name of the monastery where the scene of the session was laid. In Pāli the name of the monastery is given as Vālukārāma, and this is corroborated by the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya.[1] According to Buston, the name of the monastery was Kusumapura,[2] but it is not corroborated by any other text. Buston probably confused the capital of the province with that of the seat of the Council, or it may be that the Mahāsaṅghikas after their defeat in the Vesālian Council held another Council at the capital.

No President

A remarkable feature of the Council is that it did not elect any President. By the *ubbāhikā* process a body of referees consisting of eight monks was formed to go into the questions of dispute, and each tradition gave prominence to its favoured monk. Thus, we see that though Sabbakāmī is recognised as the Saṅghatthera, the Pāli tradition accords to Revata, a Westerner, the leadership of the Council, while the Chinese version of the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya attributes to Sambhūta Śāṇavāsī the leading part in the Council. Buston gives prominence to Sabbakāmī and Khujjasobhita (Kubjita). In view of these differences regarding the leading monk, we have to conclude that there was no elected President and the business was carried on by a Committee.

The ten un-Vinayic acts

All the earlier sources agree in stating that the main business of the Council was to examine the validity of the ten un-

1 Watters, *op. cit.*, II, p. 73. 2 Buston. II, p. 96.

Vinayic acts performed by a section of the Vesālian monks,[1] but there exists a wide divergence of opinion in their interpretations. It is difficult to decide which of the interpretations, accessible to us, should be accepted and so we should prefer that which appears more plausible.

The ten un-Vinayic acts with their interpretations, as given in the Pāli texts, are as follows:—

(i) *Siṅgiloṇa kappa*—or the practice of carrying salt in a horn for use when needed, which contravened according to one view the rule against the storing of articles of food (*cf. Pācittiya* 38).

(ii) *Dvaṅgula kappa*—or the practice of taking food after midday, lit. when the shadow (on the dial) is two digits wide (vide *Pāc.* 37).

(iii) *Gāmantara kappa*—or the practice of going to a neighbouring village and taking a second meal there the same day, committing thereby the offence of over-eating (cf. *Pāc.* 35).

(iv) *Āvāsa kappa*—or the observance of *uposathas* in different places within the same parish (*sīmā*) (prohibited in the *Mahāvagga*, II, 8, 3).

(v) *Anumati kappa*—or doing an act and obtaining its sanction afterwards (contrast *Mahāvagga*, IX, 3. 5).

(vi) *Āciṇṇa kappa*—or the use of precedents as authority.

(vii) *Amathita kappa*—or the drinking of milk-whey after meal (against *Pāc.* 35).

(viii) *Jalogiṃpātum*—or the drinking of fermenting palm-juice which is not yet toddy (against *Pāc.* 51).[1]

1 Cf. *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Gilgit ms.), *Cīvaravastu*, p. 142: मद्यं स्त्यायमानं प्रक्षिप्य भूमौ निखातव्यम्। शुक्तत्वे परिणतं परिभोक्तव्यम्। शुक्तत्वानुपयोज्यं तु छोरयितव्यम्। मां भिक्षवः शास्तारमुद्दिशद्भिर्मद्यमदेयमपेयमन्ततः कुशाग्रेणापि।

(ix) *Adasakaṃ nisīdanaṃ*—or the use of a borderless sheet to sit on (contrary to *Pāc*. 89).

(x) *Jātarūparajataṃ*—or the acceptance of gold and silver (prohibited in *Nissagg*. 18).[1]

Buston, on the basis of the tradition preserved in the Mūla-Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, enumerates the undermentioned ten acts.[2] Prof. La Vallée Poussin translated the same Tibetan passage from the *Dulva*. We reproduce below both the translations of Obermiller and de La Vallée Poussin.

(i) *Using the sacred salt:* (Obermiller) Mixing the salt that is to be kept for life-time with that which is used in general, to eat it and make it thus an object of use.[3]

(Poussin) Mixing salt consecrated for life-time with food appropriate at the moment.[4]

The Dharmaguptas and the Mahīśāsakas offer quite a different interpretation. According to them, the word *siṅgi* is *śṛṅga* (*vera*) = ginger and *loṇa* = salt. Their interpretation is to "mix the food with salt and ginger."[5]

1 For a discussion on the interpretations of the terms, see Minayeff, *Recherches*, I, pp. 44-50.

The first three rules are relaxations of the more stringent rules, made by Buddha regarding the storage of food and eating to suit the conditions created by famine in Vesāli. The people of Vesāli continued to observe the relaxed rules though they were abrogated later on by the Theravādins in their *Vinaya*.

2 The order of enumeration has been changed for the convenience of comparison with the Pāli list.

3 Cf. Çilgit Ms. leaf 93b: भक्ति भायुष्मन्तां मन्त्रापुटं लवणं यावज्जीवमधिष्ठितम् । cf. *Mv*. vi. 3. 1.

4 *Indian Antiquary*, 1908, pp. 91, 104.

5 *Ibid*., p. 91.

(ii) *Taking food with two fingers:* (Obermiller) The food that has not been left (from a previous meal) they eat, taking it with two fingers.

(L. V. P.) Eating food of both kinds, not being remainder, while using two fingers.[1]

(iii) *Eating on the way:* (Obermiller) The monks, having gone a yojana or a half, assemble and eat on the pretext that they are travelling.

(L. V. P.) Having gone a yojana or a half-yojana, and having eaten food in troop, rendered the meal in troop legal by reason of the journey.[2]

(iv) *Admission of a mixture:* (Obermiller) The monks mix a *droṇa* measure of milk with as much sour milk and drink it at undue time.

(L. V. P.) After agitating a full measure (*droṇa*) of milk with a full measure of curd, and then eating the preparation out of time.[3]

(v) *Taking intoxicating drink:* (Obermiller) The monks take wine in the manner of a leech that sucks blood and having drunk, excuse it with illness.

(L. V. P.) Drinking fermented liquor with a sucking action like leeches, rendering it legal by reason of illness.[4]

1 Dharmaguptas: "derogation from sobriety, as if, for example, a monk after an ample repast, forgetting the rule of good conduct, began to take with two fingers and to eat the food remaining."

2 The Mahīśāsakas say "to eat a second time after having risen before taking a sufficient meal."

3 The Dharmaguptas and Mahīśāsakas say: "to drink, beyond the time allowed, a mixture of cream, butter, honey and sugar.

4 According to the Mahīśāsakas, it is a question of an intoxicating liquor which had become fermented.

(vi) *Making a new rug:* (Obermiller) Taking a new rug without stitching it by a patch of the so-called Sugata span taken from the old one.

(L. V. P.) Not having patched their new mats with a border, a Sugata's cubit broad, from the old mat.[1]

(vii) *Begging gold and silver:* (Obermiller) The monks anoint an alms-bowl with fragrant spices, put it on the head of a Śramaṇa, on a table or a seat, or in a narrow passage at the four cross-roads and proclaim: This is a sublime vessel, if you deposit your gifts in it and fill it, you are to reap great merit.

(L. V. P.) Taking alms-bowls such as were round, pure and suitable for ritual, anointing them with perfumes, fumigating them with incense, adorning them with various fragrant flowers, placed on the head of a monk over a cushion went about the highways, streets and cross-roads, crying as follows. "Here, ye people, who have come from various towns and countries, and ye wise people of Vaiśālī! This *pātra* is a lucky one, to give in it is to give much, or whoever shall fill it will obtain a great fruit, a great advantage, a great activity, a great development."

[As far as the seven un-Vinayic acts, mentioned above, are concerned, all the Vinaya texts, including those of the Mahīśāsakas and the Dharmaguptas agree, though they have differed in interpretations, which have all been pointed out.]

(viii) *Digging ground:* (Obermiller) It is considered admissible for monks to live by agriculture. (L. V. P.) Turning up the soil with their own hands.[2]

1 According to the Mahīśāsakas, to make for oneself a mat of undetermined dimensions; there is no question of fringe.

2 According to the Dharmaguptas, the Vajjiputtakas 'think their conduct may be justified by alleging that "this has been done from time immemorial."'

On this un-Vinayic act, the comment of the Sarvāstivādins stands alone, and this seems to be due to careless Sanskritization of *ācinna* by *āchinna*, unconsciously changing the root (*car* to *chid*). Hence the interpretation offered by the Sarvāstivādins should be left out of account.

(ix) *Approving:* (Obermiller) They perform religious observances, and at the same time incite the monks in attendance to approve.[1] (L.V.P.) The Venerable Ones (absent brothers) having approved, do ye count it as approved, caused the resolutions of the incomplete Saṅgha to be approved by the monks of the parish.[2]

Buston or Obermiller has no doubt been misled by the Tibetan rendering of the Sanskrit word *anumodanā*, which, though derived from the root *mud*, does not carry the meaning of "rejoice". *Anumodanā* in Pāli means "acquiescence of an act done by the Saṅgha in one's absence". This is also an instance of anomaly of converting a Prakrit word into Sanskrit. We are not aware what was the original Prakrit word, but evidently the Pālists made it *anumati*. In any case, the interpretations offered by the different Vinaya texts are similar, i.e., getting an ecclesiastical act performed in an incomplete assembly approved by the absentee members.

The Mahīśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins have both omitted *āvāsakappa* of the Pāli list. It seems that these schools included

According to the Mahīśāsakas: "To continue to occupy themselves with what they had been in the habit of doing before becoming ascetics; certain occupations were declared lawful, others were forbidden."

1 "Rejoicing" of Obermiller is changed by me to "Approving."

2 The Dharmaguptas support the Pāli interpretation while the Mahīśāsakas say "in the accomplishment of an ecclesiastical act to call others one by one afterwards to hear."

all the irregularities committed by the Vajjian monks relating to the performance of ecclesiastical acts in a regular or irregular assembly within *anumodanā-kappa,* while the Theravādins (Pāli) and the Dharmaguptas have split it up into two: *anumati* and *āvāsa.* The Dharmaguptas, it will be noted, put a slightly different interpretation on *āvāsakappa.* They say that "in the *āvāsa,* besides the regular acts, the innovators accomplished others.

Perhaps in order to keep up the number of deviations as ten the Mahīśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins borrowed one point from Mahādeva's five and made it the first of their list, viz., "Exclamation of *aho*".

(x) *Exclamation of astonishment:* (Obermiller) The monks of Vaiśālī perform religious observances and at the same time they admit such exclamations as *aho.*

(L. V. P.) The monks of Vaiśālī having rendered legal the exclamation *aho* performed an ecclesiastical act illegally in an incomplete or complete Saṅgha or legally in an incomplete Saṅgha.

The interpretation given in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins is a laboured one and appears more or less a repetition of the previous un-Vinayic act of the Vajjiputtakas.

The exclamation of *aho* reminds us of the fifth point of Mahādeva, viz., the path is attained by an exclamation. This has been discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* (xi. 4) under the heading: *'Idaṃ dukkhan ti' vācam bhāsato 'idaṃ dukkhan ti' ñāṇaṃ pavattatī ti.*[1]

A comparison of the two lists (Pāli and Sanskrit) shows that both the traditions have worked on a common original list,

1 See *Infra,* p. 41.

which was probably in a Prakrit, and definitely neither in Sanskrit nor in Pāli. This we state on the basis of the change noticed in the words: *siṅgiloṇa, ācinna* and *anumati.* The anomaly of *āvāsa* can hardly be explained. As regards the remaining six items, the interpretations of both the schools are allowable and either exposition may be accepted.

Five propositions of Mahādeva

Vasumitra, followed by Bhavya and Vinītadeva, writes that on account of the five propositions propounded by Mahādeva, the Saṅgha became divided into two schools: the Mahāsaṅghika and the Sthaviravāda. The five points are: —

The Arhats

1. are subject to temptation (cf. *Kvu.* II. 1. *Atthi arahato rāgo ti?*)
2. may have residue of ignorance (cf. *Kvu.* II. 2: *Atthi arahato aññāṇan ti?*)
3. may have doubts regarding certain matters (cf. *Kvu.* II. 3: *Atthi arahato kaṅkhā ti?*)
4. gain knowledge through others' help (cf. *Kvu.* II. 4: *Atthi arahato paravitāraṇā ti?*).
5. The Path is attained by an exclamation (as "*aho*") (cf. *Kvu.* II. 3 & 4 & XI. 4).

Watters has collected some information regarding the life of Mahādeva from the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā-luṅ* (ch. 99).[1] According to this work, Mahādeva was the son of a brāhmin merchant of Mathurā. He had his ordination at Kukkuṭārāma in Pāṭaliputta. By his zeal and abilities, he soon became the head of the Buddhist establishment there. The ruling king was

1 Watters, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 267-8.

a friend and patron of Mahādeva. With his help, he was able to oust the senior orthodox monks and establish his five dogmas, as enumerated above. Yuan Chwang writes that at the instance of the reigning king, an assembly of monks was summoned, in which the senior brethren, who were arhats, voted against the five dogmas, which however, were supported by a large majority of ordinary ordained members, i.e., non-arhats.

The Chinese pilgrim, it will be observed, mentioned both the five dogmas of Mahādeva (Watters, I, p. 267) and the few un-Vinayic acts of the Vesālian monks (Watters, II, p. 73) as the cause of the session of the Council and the cleavage in the Saṅgha. The writer of the *Kathāvatthu* was aware of the five dogmas. Buddhaghosa attributed them to the Mahāsaṅghikas, so there can be no doubt that the statement of Vasumitra and others is authentic. The *Dīpavaṃsa* also states that the seceders introduced alterations in the doctrines as well.

Conclusion

Now the questions that can be raised are: To which of the two causes is due the schism? Or is the schism due to both the causes? We prefer the second alternative and may account for the two traditions thus: The division of monks began with the differences of opinion regarding the interpretation of the ten Vinaya rules some time before the appearance of Mahādeva (or Nāga)[1] i.e., during the reign of Kālāsoka. It was about half a century after this event that Mahādeva or Nāga propounded his five dogmas during the reign of king Nanda and his disciple Sthiramati propagated it further. As regards the fact that the

1 See above, p. 24, where Nāga is described as a disciple of Mahādeva, and Sthiramati as a disciple of Nāga.

tradition of the breach of ten Vinaya rules appears in the Vinaya texts and the Ceylonese chronicles while the tradition about Mahādeva's five dogmas appears in the Tibetan and Chinese versions of Vasumitra's and other writers' text on the doctrine of the schools, we may state that the Vinaya texts being concerned with the disciplinary aspect of the religion passed over the doctrinal differences while Vasumitra and other writers being more concerned with doctrinal differences than with disciplinary rules, considered it unnecessary to repeat the ten un-Vinayic acts of the Vesālian monks. The sources of information of the Ceylonese chronicles being the Vinaya texts, these also passed over the doctrinal differences, Yuan Chwang, being an annalist, was interested in both doctrines and disciplines and so he recorded the divergences in regard to both. It is quite probable that the schism began with disciplinary rules and in course of time, incorporated matters of doctrine.

It is apparent from the subject-matter of the ten un-Vinayic acts and the five points of Mahādeva, that the Vesālians wanted a certain amount of latitude and freedom in the interpretation and observance of the rules,[1] and to carry into their organizations and general governance a democratic spirit which was gradually disappearing from the Buddhist Saṅgha. The exclusive powers and privileges which the arhats claimed for themselves were looked upon with disfavour by the Vesālians. The claim of the arhats to become members of important Councils and make their decisions binding on the non-arhats did not appeal

1 The Vesālian monks are called Vajjiputtakas in the Pali tradition. In the *Aṅguttara* (I, p. 230) we notice that a Vajjiputtaka monk approached Buddha saying that it would be difficult for him to observe the 250 rules of the Pātimokkha.

to the Vajjians—a clan imbued with a thorough democratic spirit. The five propositions of Mahādeva also indicated that the arhats were not 'perfect' men as was claimed by the orthodox and that the arhats also had a few limitations. The Vesālians refused to be bound down by the decision of the arhats, and instead they convened a Council of all arhats and non-arhats, calling it a Mahāsaṅgīti and agreed to abide by the decisions of the enlarged Council. This new body believed sincerely that the decisions taken by them were in conformity with what they had learnt from Buddha.

Effect on the Church

Some of the Vesālian monks separated themselves from the Saṅgha of the Elders or the Orthodox, called the Thera- or Sthaviravādins, and organised a new one of their own, calling it Mahā-saṅgha, from which they came to be known as the Mahā-saṅghikas. From now on, the cleavage in the Saṅgha began to widen and widen, ultimately giving rise to as many as eighteen to twenty-five sects. The Thera- or Sthavira-vādins were split up into eleven sects but remained Hīnayāna throughout their existence, while the Mahā-saṅghikas became divided into seven sects, gradually gave up their Hīnayāna doctrines, and became the fore-runners of Mahāyānism. Once the disruptive forces were set in motion the Saṅgha could no longer remain a single whole. Sect after sect came into existence on slight differences of opinion concerning doctrines, disciplinary rules, and even cutting, colouring and wearing of robes.

In view of the general agreement of the different traditions, the session of the Second Council is taken as historical by the present-day writers. There can be no question about the fact that the Council marked the beginning of divisions in the Buddhist

church, and that the disruption hinged on the ten un-Vinayic rules. The different traditions agree about nine of the ten rules though they may have differed in their interpretations. The only point which requires further evidences is the date of the Council and the name of the king under whose auspices the Council was held. The Ceylonese chronicles gives Kālāsoka as the name of the king. Kālāsoka succeeded Susunāga and is identified now with Kākavarṇin of the Purāṇas (see above, p. 22). In view of the fact that Susunāga transferred his capital to Vesāli, it is not unlikely that his son should continue to make Vesāli his royal seat and take interest in the affairs of the monks who were residents of the capital. If Kālāsoka be accepted as the royal patron of the Council,[1] the date of its session will have to be put about a century after Buddha's death. Kern has questioned the statement of the Ceylonese chronicles about the age of the monks who took leading parts in the deliberations of the Council and pointed out that the names do not include any of the list of teachers given in the fifth chapter of the *Mahāvaṃsa*.[2] Kern's apprehensions are not baseless and so we should take the statement of the *Mahāvaṃsa* that some of the monks lived at the time of Buddha[3] with a certain amount of caution. As far as the line of teachers is concerned, Kern overlooks the fact that it is a list of succession of the spiritual teachers of Moggaliputta Tissa and not a list of succession of the Saṅghattheras. Kern's conclusion that the Second Council "preceded but had no connection with the schism of the Mahāsaṅghikas"

1 Kern thinks that Kāla Asoka is none other than Dharma-Asoka in his early days.

2 *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 108-9.

3 *Mahāvaṃsa*, IV, 59.

seems to be his personal conviction and not based on any evidence and so is his remark that Kāla-Asoka was Dharma-Asoka in his early days. Vasumitra places the session of the Council during the reign of Mahāpadma Nanda. This statement is probably due to the confusion made by Vasumitra that Mahādeva's five propositions were the original causes of the schism.

CHAPTER VI

APPEARANCE OF THE BUDDHIST SCHOOLS OF THOUGHTS

It has been shown that within the period of Buddha's ministry which covered less than half a century, the various forces leading to dissensions were already at work. It was not therefore unusual that in the absence of the Teacher, the disruptive forces were still more active, and inspite of all precautions against Saṅghabheda, caused the origin of as many as eighteen or more schools within a century and a half.

We have two independent traditions about the secession of the Schools, one preserved in the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā,* the Ceylonese chronicles and the Sinhalese *Nikāya-saṅgraha,* and the other in the treatises of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva. Though there are slight deviations in the order of secession of the schools, the two traditions, as shown in the annexed table, agree substantially. Vasumitra has assigned little later dates to the origin of some of the schools, but the dates are too vague to be of any consequence to us.

Vinītadeva and the author of the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgrapṛcchā* divided the eighteen sects in five groups thus:—

I. & II. M a h ā s a ṅ g h i k a s comprising Pūrvaśaila, Aparaśaila, Haimavata, Lokottaravāda and Prajñaptivāda.

III. S a r v ā s t i v ā d i n s comprising Mūlasarvāstivāda, Kāśyapīya, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmagupta, Bahuśrutīya, Tāmraśāṭīya and a section of the Vibhajyavāda.

IV. S ā ṃ m i t ī y a s comprising Kaurukullaka, Avantaka and Vātsīputrīya.

V. Sthaviras comprising Jetavanīya, Abhayagirivāsin, and Mahāvihāravāsin.

Vinītadeva's information and classification evidently point to a posterior date. He includes some of the later schools into his enumeration and omits some of the older schools which were probably extinct by his time, e.g., the Ekavyavahārika, Gokulika, Dharmottariya, and Bhadrayānika. Particularly noticeable is his inclusion of the Ceylonese sects like Jetavanīya[1] (i.e. Sāgalika of the *Mahāvaṃsa*, v. 13), Abhayagirivāsin[2] (i.e. Dhammarucika of the *Mahāvaṃsa*, v. 13) and the Mahāvihāravāsin. The Jetavanīya, it will be noted, came into existence as late as the reign of Mahāsena (5th century A.D.).

Tāranātha in his 42nd chapter (*Kurze Betrachtung des Sinnes der vier Schulen*[3]) furnishes us with very important identifications of the different names of schools appearing in the lists of Bhavya, Vasumitra Vinītadeva and others. After reproducing the several lists, he gives the following identifications:—

(i) Kāśyapīya = Suvarṣaka.

(ii) Saṃkrāntivādin = Uttarīya = Tāmraśāṭīya.

(iii) Caityaka = Pūrvaśaila = Schools of Mahādeva.

(iv) Lokottaravāda = Kaukkuṭika.

(v) Ekavyavahārika is a general name of the Mahāsaṅghikas.

(vi) Kaurukullaka, Vātsīputrīya, Dharmottarīya, Bhadrayānīya and Channagarika held almost similar views.[4]

1 *Vaṃsaṭṭha*, p. 175; Sāgalikā nāma Mahāsenarañño Jetavanavāsino bhikkhu.

2 *Ibid.* It was founded in Ceylon during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi.

3 Schiefner, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-274.

4 Tāranātha tells us further that during the reign of the Pāla king, seven schools only were known. These were

These identifications help us to trace the Uttarāpathakas of the *Kathāvatthu*. This school should be identified with the Uttarīyas of Bhavya and the Saṃkrāntivādins of Vasumitra or Saṃkrāntikas of the Pāli texts. The Saṃkrāntivādins were also known as the Tāmraśāṭīyas probably on account of their copper-coloured robes. Out of these Tāmraśāṭīyas or Uttarāpathakas or Saṃkrāntivādins or Dārṣṭāntikas arose the Sautrāntikas, who are often mentioned in the *Saṃkarabhāṣya*, *Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha* and such other works of the Brāhmanic schools of philosophy.

A comparison of the different lists of Schools shows that the grouping of Schools fairly agrees with one another. The Mahāsaṅghika branches may be sub-divided into two groups one earlier and the other later.

The earlier (or the first) group comprised the original Mahāsaṅghikas, Ekavyavahārikas and Caityakas or Lokottaravādins. According to Tāranātha, Ekavyavahārikas and the Mahāsaṅghikas were almost identical. The chief centre of this group was at Pāṭaliputra.

The later (or the second) group of Schools came into existence long after the Mahāsaṅghikas. They became widely known as the Śaila Schools or the Andhakas,[1] and made their chief centre at Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. With them

(i) Sāṃmitīya comprising Vātsīputrīya and Kaurukullaka.
(ii) Mahāsaṃghika comprising Prajñaptivāda and Lokottaravāda.
(iii) Sarvāstivāda comprising Tāmraśāṭīya and Sarvāstivāda. The former became known as Dārṣṭāntika, out of which developed the Sautrāntika School. This corroborates Masuda's remark as against that of de la Vallee Poussin that the Dārṣṭāntikas preceded the Sautrāntikas. See *Asia Major*, p. 67, fn.

1 To the Andhakas should be added the Vetulyakas and the Hetuvādins of the *Kathāvatthu*.

may be classed the Bahuśrutīyas and Prajñaptivādins, as the former had more agreement in doctrinal matters with the Śaila Schools than with the Mahāsaṅghikas while the latter had its origin as a protest against the doctrins of the Bahuśrutīyas.

The third group of Schools is formed by the earlier Mahīśāsakas, and Sarvāstivādins with the later Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Saṃkrāntikas or Uttarāpathakas,[1] or Tāmraśāṭīyas.

The fourth group comprised the Vajjiputtakas or Vātsīputrīyas with Dharmottarīyas, Bhadrayānikas, Channagarikas, and Sammitiyas, and also Kaurukullakas. In this group, practically all the schools merged in one, *viz.*, the Vātsīputrīyas, otherwise known as the Sāṃmitiyas.

The last, the fifth group but the earliest in origin was the Theravāda which, as Vinītadeva says, formed a group with the Ceylonese sects, *viz.*, Jetavanīya, Abhayagirivāsins and Mahāvihāravāsins.

1 Vasumitra gives Sautrāntika as an alternative name of Saṃkrantikas or Saṃkrāntivāda. See Masuda, *Asia Major*, II. p. 67 fn. The Sautrāntikas are called Uttarāpathakas in the *Kathāvatthu*. See *Infra*.

CHAPTER VII

SCHOOLS OF GROUPS I & II: THEIR HISTORY & LITERATURE

The first two groups in our scheme included the Mahāsaṅghikas with all their sub-sects. Scanning the various traditions about the appearance of the sub-sects, we notice that Vasumitra and Bhavya[1] agreed with the *Kathāvatthu* as far as the first three sub-divisions[2] were concerned, if Cetiya be taken as an alternative name of Lokottaravāda. In the *Mahāvastu*, which is an avowed text of the Lokottaravāda branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas, worship of *caityas* is given special prominence, hence it will not be out of the way to say that the Lokottaravādins, on account of their devotion to *caityas*, were also called Caityakas.

Sometime after the appearance of these three sub-sects, came into existence two further sub-sects, *viz.*, Bahuśrutīyas and Prajñaptivādins. According to Vasumitra and Bhavya, they issued out of the Mahāsaṅghikas direct while in the *Kathāvatthu* and Ceylonese traditions, they are made sub-divisions of the Gokulikas though the Gokulikas do not appear to have become an important sect at any time. The doctrines of these two later schools are allied to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas or the Sarvāstivādins.

1 Vinītadeva's list, being of a later date, may be left out of account. See *Infra*.

2 Kaukkuṭika (Gokulika), Lokottaravāda (Cetiya) and Ekavyavahārika (Ekabbohāra).

The importance and popularity of the Mahāsaṅghikas have been raised not so much by the sub-sects mentioned above but by the schools, which came into existence still later, we mean, the Śaila schools of Vasumitra and Bhavya and the Andhakas of the Pāli tradition. The former speak of three Śaila schools, Caitya, Apara and Uttara, while in Pāli appear four or five names: Hemavatika, Rājagirika, Siddhatthika, Pubbaseliya and Aparaseliya. Though the Pāli tradition is partially corroborated by Vinītadeva's list, it has been fully borne out by the inscriptions recently unearthed at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, where as also at Amarāvatī (Dhanakaṭaka) appear the following names:—

(i) Hamghi (Burgess, p. 105)
Ayira-haghāna (*EI.*, XX, pp. 17, 20)
(ii) Caityika (Burgess, pp. 100, 102)
Cetiavadaka (*Ibid.*, p. 102)
(iii) Aparamahāvanaseliya (*EI.*, XX, p. 41)
Mahāvanaseliyāna (Burgess, p. 105)
(iv) Puvasele (*EI.*, XX, p. 22)
(v) Rājagiri-nivāsika (Burgess, p. 53)
Rājaśaila (*Ibid.*, p. 104)
(vi) Sidhathikā (*Ibid.*, p. 110)
(vii) Bahusutiya (*EI.*, XX, p. 24)
(viii) Mahīśāsaka (*Ibid.*)

Excepting the last, the rest are all sub-branches of the Mahāsaṅghika school.[1]

Out of twelve names of the Pāli tradition, we come across seven in the above-mentioned inscriptions. This testimony indicates the authenticity of the Pāli tradition. Vinītadeva replaces Bahuśrutīyā of the inscriptions by Prajñaptivāda, otherwise he

1 See *IHQ.*, vol. VII, p. 646-7 for further details.

upheld the traditions preserved in Pāli and the inscriptions. The Śaila schools of later days placed the Mahāsaṅghikas in the shade. It seems that the earlier Mahāsaṅghikas were not concentrated in one centre as were the Śailas. The former remained scattered over N. W. India, Behar and Western India, while the latter were concentrated at Śrīparvata and Dhanakaṭaka (in mod. Guntur District). The inscriptions indicate that a magnificent *caitya* was erected here and its grandeur and sanctity attracted devotees from places all over India and Ceylon. According to the inscriptions, the date of erection of the *caitya* should be placed some time about the 3rd or 4th century A.D.

The first group of schools, comprising the Mahāsaṅghikas, Ekavyavahārikas and the Caityakas (or Lokottaravādins) had generally common doctrines with minor differences, which have not been carefully distinguished by Vasumitra. As regards the doctrines of the second group of schools, *viz.*, the Śailas or the Andhakas, the Bahuśrutīyas, and Prajñaptivādins, Vasumitra has equally been taciturn. It is in the *Kathāvatthu* that we find a large number of doctrines, specially attributed to this group, and scanning the doctrines, it appears that this group accepted some of the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins. We propose to discuss the doctrines of the first and second groups separately, but as the materials for the history and literature of both these groups are scanty, we shall have to take up their treatment together.

Their origin and literature

In the account of the Second Council, we have already shown how and when the Mahāsaṅghikas appeared in the field; and what disciplinary rules and dogmas were upheld by them. In the history of Buddhism, they were the earliest seceders to come into the field.

In the *Dīpavaṃsa*,[1] it is stated that they did not stop at introducing only the ten new Vinaya rules but went further and propounded new doctrines contrary to the established ones. At the Mahāsaṅgīti held by them, in reciting the Sūtras and the Vinaya, they made alterations in the texts, their arrangement and interpretations. They replaced portions of the text by others according to their liking, and even rejected certain parts of the canon though they had been accepted in Mahākassapa's council. They did not include in the Piṭaka collection,[2] *Parivāra, Abhidhammappakaraṇa, Paṭisambhidā, Niddesa,* and the *Jātakas*. The importance and accuracy of the decision by which the Mahāsaṅghikas discriminated between the original portions and the later interpolations are found in the full support that the decision obtains from modern researches bearing out their discrimination in *toto*. The *Parivāra* (*pāṭha*), meant as a manual for the bhikkhus, is no doubt a composition of a date much later than that of the Canon.[3] The Abhidhamma literature also developed after the Council of Vesāli and obtained its final shape in Aśoka's Council.[4] Lastly the three works, the *Paṭisambhidā*, the *Niddesa* and the *Jātakas* too have been added to the Canon without much discrimination and evidently long after its close. In view of the contents, it would have been proper if the *Paṭisambhidā* had been included in the *Abhidhamma* collection, and the *Niddesa*, an old commentary on the *Sutta Nipāta*, along with the *Jātakas* which is a commentary on the canonical Jātaka book, had been altogether excluded from the Piṭaka collection.

1 *Dīpavaṃsa*, ch. iv. 2 *Dīpavaṃsa*, V, 32-38.

3 Rhys Davids, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 42; Oldenberg's *Intro. to the Vinaya Piṭaka*, I, p. xxxiv.

4 Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiv.

From all these testimonies mentioned above, it is apparent that like the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahāsaṅghikas also had a complete canon of their own in its three divisions. References to the canon of the Mahāsaṅghikas are found in the inscriptions discovered at Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. On the pillar of an outer railing of the Amarāvatī stūpa there are two inscriptions, one of which speaks of certain nuns as *Vinayadhara*[1] and another of the monks of Mahāvanaseliya as *Mahāvinayadhara*.[2] These distinctly imply the existence of a Vinayapiṭaka in that region about the beginning of the Christian era.

There are similar references to the Sūtra-piṭaka also, but in more details. In an inscription[3] on one of the slabs found near the Central stūpa of Amarāvatī there is a reference to a monk of Mahāvanasālā as *Saṃyuta-bhāṇaka* (not *Saṃyutabhātuka*, as read by Burgess). In the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, appear the following inscriptions in the Āyaka pillars C_1 and C_2: *Dīgha-Majhima-paṃcamātuka-osaka-vācakānaṃ*, *Dīgha-Majhima-nikāya-dharena*, *Dīgha-Majhima-paṃḍa-mātuka-desaka vācakānaṃ* and *Dīgha-Ma-nigoya-dharena*. These leave no room for doubt about the existence of a Sutta-piṭaka in at least three Nikāyas: *Dīgha*, *Majjhima* and *Saṃyukta*.

There also occurs the expression *Pañca-mātuka* which is a Prākrit form of *Pañca-mātṛkā* or (Pāli) Pañca-mātikā. In Pāli, *mātikā* is the usual term for the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. Among the Vinaya texts in Chinese, catalogued by Nanjio, there are

1 Burgess, *Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvatī and Jaggayyapeta* (Arch. Sur. of S. India), p. 37.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 102.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 91 (Plate xlviii, 35), see also p. 105.

four works with *mātṛkā* as a part of their titles, though none of these belong to the Mahāsaṅghikas.[1] Prof. Przyluski writes[2] the Mahāsaṅghikas had a particular fancy for the number "five", specially in connection with the Vinaya rules. *Mātṛkā* was used by the ancient writers to denote the Vinaya-piṭaka as much as the Abhidharma-piṭaka, hence the word 'Paṃca-mātuka' of the inscriptions may well mean the Vinaya-piṭaka of the Mahāsaṅghikas whose text also had five divisions like the other schools.[3]

Fa-hien (414 A.D.) took away, from Pāṭaliputra to China, a complete transcript of the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya and translated it into Chinese two years later.[4] According to Yuan Chwang the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṅghikas was the same as the one reiterated in the First Council. In Nanjio's *Catalogue* are mentioned two Vinaya texts of this school, viz., Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya and Mahāsaṅgha-bhikṣuṇī Vinaya (No. 543). Fortunately, there is the original *Mahāvastu*,[5] which is the first volume of the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Lokottaravādins, a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas. It corresponds to that part of the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka, which gives an account of Buddha's life and his formation of the first Saṅgha. By Buddha's life, the compiler meant not merely his present life but the events of his past lives as well, by recounting which he showed that a particular event in this life was only a repetition or result of the past. The account is divided into three sections like the *Nidāna-kathā* of the *Jātakas*, the first

1 See *IHQ.*, vol. VII, p. 644-5.
2 Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 212.
3 Przyluski, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 357, 359.
4 Takakusu, *Records of the Buddhist Religion by I-tsing*, p. xx.
5 Senart's ed. p. 2.

dealing with his existences during the time of Dīpaṅkara and other Buddhas, the secnod with his life in Tuṣita heaven, and the third with his present life, agreeing mostly with the contents of the Pāli *Mahāvagga.* Apart from a few rules relating to ordination, it has nothing to do with the disciplinary matters. It contains a few Prakrit versions of the sūtras of the *Nikāyas, Sutta-nipāta, Dhammapada* and a few other texts. It is more a collection of Jātakas, than a text on Vinaya. Winternitz thinks that its date of composition should be placed between the 2nd century B.C. and the 4th century A.D.[1]

Yuan Chwang states that the Mahāsaṅghikas accepted the canon as rehearsed in Kassapa's Council but they included certain discourses which had been rejected in the first recitation as non-canonical. He further states that the canon of the Mahāsaṅghikas was divided into four parts: *Sūtra, Vinaya, Abhidharma* and *Dhāraṇī.*

Language of the Mahāsaṅghika-Piṭaka

Bu-ston[2] tells us that the Mahāsaṅghikas claimed Mahākāśyapa as their founder, and that the language of their Piṭaka was Prākrit. The language of the *Mahāvastu,* specially of its poetry portion, is mixed Sanskrit and which may well be called a Prākrit.[3]

1 See Winternitz, *History of Buddhist Literature,* II, p. 239; B. C. Law, *A Study of the Mahāvastu,* 1930.

2 Besides their own language, Buston adds, their robes had 23 to 27 fringes, and their badge was a conch-shell. Bu-ston, II, p. 100. *Cf.* Csoma Körösi, *JASB.,* 1838, p. 134; Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus,* p. 294-5; Eitel's *Handbook of Chinese Buddhism,* p. 88.

3 See Keith, Foreword to B. C. Law's *Study of the Mahāvastu.*

Principal seats of the schools

The different traditons about the Second Council indicate that a section of the Vajjiputtakas held another council, Mahāsaṅgīti, at Kusumapura, i.e., Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Kālāsoka. Yuan Chwang also remarks that "the majority of inferior brethren at Pāṭaliputra began the Mahāsaṅghika school."[1] Fa-hien, as stated above, found the Vinaya of this school at Pāṭaliputra, so, it may be safely concluded that the chief centre of this school was at Pāṭaliputra. I-tsing (671-695 A.D.) tells us that the Mahāsaṅghikas were found in his time mostly in Magadha (Central India) and a few in Lāṭa and Sindhu (Western India) and some in a few places in Northern, Southern and Eastern India.[2] Before I-tsing, both Fa-hien and Yuan Chwang had come across in these localities the adherents of this school though not so frequently as those of the others. The earliest epigraphical notice of this school is found in the inscription on Mathurā Lion Capital (about 120 B.C.),[3] mentioning that it had a very strong opponent in Buddhila, an adherent of the Sarvāstivāda school.

At Andarab in Afghanistan and its neighbouring places, there were also some followers of this school. During the reign of Huviṣka, one Kamagulya deposited some relics of Buddha in the Wardak vase and presented the same to the teachers of the Mahāsaṅghika school. The vault which contained the relic-vase was built by the father of Kamagulya.[4] At Andarab which was three days journey from the country of the Wardaks, Yuan Chwang found the adherents of this school in three monasteries.[5]

1 Watters, *op. cit.*, I, p. 269. 2 Takakusu, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiii.
3 *Ep. Indica,* IX, pp. 139, 141, 146.
4 *Ep. Indica,* XI, p. 211.
5 Watters' *Yuan Chwang,* II, pp. 267, 269.

There was another centre of the school at Karle, in the Bombay Presidency, famous in the history of Buddhist architecture for its possession of the largest and finest cave-temples,[1] which are still standing as memorials of their past glory. That this cave was in the possession of the Mahāsaṅghikas is shown by two inscriptions at the cave-temples, one recording the gift of the village of Karajaka by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi to the monks of the Vāluraka caves for the support of the school of the Mahāsaṅghikas,[2] and the other of the time of Vāśiṣṭiputra Siripulumāyi recording the gift of a nine-celled hall to the same school by an inhabitant of Abulama.[3] Though the Mahāsaṅghikas did not receive much attention from the Buddhist writers and donors, the Karle caves show that the school commanded a great popularity in that part of the Bombay Presidency where the caves exist; for, otherwise the cave-temples could not have been so richly decorated with such fine specimens of sculptural and architectural beauty. Its existence and richness prove that there was a series of donors through centuries anxious to express their religious devotion and zeal in the best way that their resources could command.

The above inscriptional evidences relate to the Mahāsaṅghikas alone, who as it appears from the evidences were scattered probably in small groups in a few localities of North-western, Western and Eastern India, and had their main centre at Pāṭaliputra or Kusumapura.

The career of the off-shoots of this school, however, took a different course. They were mainly located in one country, the

1 See for its description Fergusson's *Indian & Eastern Architecture*, pp. 117 ff.; Fergusson and Burgess, *Cave Temples of India*, pp. 232 ff.

2 *Ep. Indica*, vol. VII, pp. 64 ff.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 71 ff.

Andhra, for which they were given in the Ceylonese chronicles the collective name of the Andhakas. We have seen above (p. 52) that their names appear more than once in the Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa inscriptions. Just as Bodh-Gaya grew up on the bank of the Nerañjarā as a very early centre of Theravāda and a place of pilgrimage for the early Buddhists so also did Amarāvatī (extending to Jaggayapeta) and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa on the bank of the Kṛṣṇā (including its tributary Paler) grow as a flourishing centre of the off-shoots of the Mahāsaṅghikas in the first century B.C. or A.D. and became a place of pilgrimage for the Buddhists of the later days.

On the basis of the style of sculptures and the palæographic data, Burgess, agreeing with Fergusson, holds that the construction of the Amarāvatī Stūpa was commenced in the 2nd century B.C., and enlarged later and decorated with new sculptures, the latest of which was the great railing erected a little before 200 A.D.[1] It was some time after the completion of this Amarāvatī stūpa, that the stūpas at Jaggayyapeta and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa came into existence, their dates being, according to Burgess and Vogel respectively, the 3rd or 4th century A.D.[2] This estimate of date is based on palæographic evidences and the mention of the king called Māḍharīputa Siri Virapurisadata (=Māṭharīputra Śrī Vīrapuruṣadatta) of the Ikṣvāku dynasty.[3] The inscriptions on the *āyaka*-pillars at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa contain not only the name of this king, but also that of his father Vāseṭhīputa Siri Cāṃtamūla and his son and successor Vāseṭhīputa Siri

1 Burgess, *Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvatī and Jaggayyapeta* (Arch. Survey of Southern India), p. 112-3.

2 *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 2.

3 Bühler assigns 3rd century A.D. to the reign of king Purisadata, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 2, quoting *Ind. Ant.*, XI (1882), pp. 256 ff.

Ehuvuḷa Cāṃtamūla.[1] It appears from the inscriptions that the principal donor of the subsidiary structures of the stūpa was Cāṃtasiri, the sister of the king Siri Cāṃtamūla, and the paternal aunt (*pitucha*), later on, probably mother-in-law, of the king Siri Vīrapurisadata.[2] Hence, the time of the inscriptions, mentioning the names of the kings Cāṃtasiri and Vīrapurisadata, is the 3rd or the 4th century A.D. It should be remembered that the period mentioned here relates to the subsidiary structures of the main stūpa, and not to the stūpa itself—the Mahācetiya, which must be assigned to an earlier period.

It is evident therefore that the off-shoots of the Mahāsaṅghikas, viz., the Caitya and Śaila schools migrated to the Guntur district from Pāṭaliputra through Orissa and made their settlement in that region in the 2nd century B.C. During the course of four or five centuries of their residence, they gradually extended their monasteries to the neighbouring hills, becoming one day a place of pilgrimage for all Buddhists.

The offshoots of this school, the Lokottaravādins and Caityakas, in other words, the Śaila schools, we know from the inscriptions of Amarāvatī ahd Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, established themselves along the banks of the Kṛṣṇā with several monasteries located on the different hills all round. In the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* and the Ceylonese chronicles they are given the appellation of Andhakas, indicating thereby that they mainly belonged to the Andhra country.

In short, the earlier schools (i.e. the First Group) were located at Pāṭaliputra with adherents scattered all over Northern and North-western India, while the later schools (i.e. the Second Group) were concentrated in the south, having their chief centre in the Guntur district on the banks of the Kṛṣṇā.

1 *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 3. 2 *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VIII (*A*)

DOCTRINES OF GROUP I SCHOOLS

The Mahāsaṅghikas & Lokottaravādins

Our main sources of information for the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Lokottaravādins are the *Mahāvastu, Kathāvatthu* and works of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva. In the *Mahāvastu,* the doctrines mentioned are essentially Hīnayānic in character, e.g., the four truths,[1] eightfold path,[2] theory of *pratītyasamutpāda,*[3] impermanence of *skandhas,*[4] non-existence of *ātman,*[5] theory of *karma,*[6] the *bodhipakṣiya-dharmas, bodhyaṅgas* and so forth. The doctrines of *dharma-śūnyatā, trikāya,* the two *āvaraṇas* (*kleśa* and *jñeya*), the essentials of *Mahāyānic* doctrines receive little attention. The accounts of the four *caryās,*[7] ten *bhūmis,*[8] countless Buddhas and their *kṣetras* (spheres) appear more as interpolations than as integral parts of the original text.

Re. Buddha and Bodhisattva. The only Mahāyānic feature of the text is the deification of Buddha and Bodhisattva. A Bodhisattva is described as self-born (*upapāduka*) and not born of parents; he sits cross-legged in the womb and preaches therefrom to the gods who act as his protectors; while in the womb he remains untouched by the phlegm and such other matters

1 *Mahāvastu,* III, pp. 331-3. 2 *Ibid.*
3 *Ibid.* p. 448-9. 4 *Ibid.,* III, p. 345.
5 *Ibid.,* pp. 335-7, 447; III, p. 66.
6 *Ibid.,* II, p. 363. III, p. 65. 7 *Mtu.* I, p. 145, 153-4.
8 *Mtu.* I, p. 144; cf. *Lalitavistara,* p. 65.

of the womb, and he issues out of the womb by the right side without piercing it.[1] He cannot have *kāma* and so Rāhula was also self-born. But it will be observed that such conceptions about the Bodhisattva appear only in the introductory portion (p. 193) of the *Mahāvastu*, and very rarely in the remaining portion of the text. There are occasional references to Buddha as *lokottara*,[2] but it seems that the *lokottara* conception had not yet taken firm hold of the people's minds. Buddha's acquisitions are said to be all supramundane and cannot be compared to anything worldly.[3] His spiritual practices are supramundane and so are his merits, even his bodily movements such as walking, standing, sitting and lying are also supramundane. His eating, his putting on robes and such other acts are also supramundane. It is for following the ways of the world (*lokānuvartana*) that he shows his *iryāpathas*. His feet are clean, still he washes them. His mouth smells like the lotus, still he cleans his teeth. His body is not touched by the sun or wind or rain, still he puts on garment and lives under a roof. He cannot have any disease and still he takes medicine to cure himself.[4] This *lokottara* conception also appears only in the introductory portion of the *Mahāvastu;* and so it is evident that the text was originally an out and out Hīnayāna text, and that in course of time, the introductory chapters were added, and very probably the addition was made by one of its later offshoots, the Lokottaravādins.

1 *Ibid.*, I, p. 148: परिपुर्णेहि च दशहि मासेहि सः बोधिसत्त्वाः मातुः कुक्षौ प्रादुर्भवन्ति दक्षिणेन पार्श्वेन, न च तं पार्श्वं भिद्यते।

2 *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 48.

3 *Mabāvastu*, I, p. 159: न हि किंचित् सम्यक्संबुद्धानां लोकेन समं। अथ खलु सर्वमेव महर्षिणां लोकोत्तरम्। तथा हि सम्यक् संबुद्धानां समुदागमः सोऽपि लोकोत्तरः।

4 For the beautiful inspiring account read the *Mahāvastu*, I, pp. 167-170.

In the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *Vyākhyā*, it is said that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Buddhas appear at the same time in more than one world,[1] and that they are omniscient in the sense that they know all *dharmas* at the same time. The former statement appears also in the *Kathāvatthu* (xxi, 6), in which it is stated that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Buddhas exist in all corners of the world (*sabbā disā Buddhā tiṭṭhanti*). In the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Kośa*, no special doctrines about the Bodhisattva conception are attributed to the Mahāsaṅghikas.

Re. Arhat. There is a sharp difference of opinion among the various schools on the problem, *viz.*, whether arhathood is identical with *mukti* or not? Those who adhere to the former view state that an arhat cannot recede from *arhathood*. This was the view of the Śaila schools and a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas.[2] From Mahādeva's five points, we have to infer that a section of the earlier Mahāsaṅghikas adhered to the opposite view, viz., that an arhat may fall from *arhathood*. In this respect the *Kathāvatthu*[3] and the *Kośa*[4] come to our aid. These texts state that, according to a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas, the arhats are not omniscient like Buddha (vide *Kvu.*, XXI, 3) and that they are subject to fall from arhathood.[5] The *Kośa* (ii, p. 210) incidentally mentions that an adept who has attained the *nirodha-samāpatti* (meditation in which perception ceases almost completely), appertaining to the fourth *dhyāna*, cannot have a fall from that state. The Theravādins admit *pattaparihāni*

1 *Kośa*, iii. 200; ix, 254.

2 Vide Masuda, p. 27; *Kośa* (Poussin's transl.), vi, p. 255 fn.

3 *Kvu.* I. 2: Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti?

4 *Kośa-vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 568-9.

5 *Kvu. Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 35: Ekacce Mahāsaṅghikā arahato parihāniṃ icchati.

(loss of what is attained) of those adepts who have attained only *lokiya-samāpatti* (meditation limited to the worldly sphere) and not the higher fruits of sanctification (*arhatādisāmaññaphala*) while the opponents speak of retrogression of the latter also, but confine it only to those arhats who are *samayavimuttas*.[1] The basis of this contention of the opponents is a passage of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (iii. 173), in which Buddha says that five *ārāmatā* (indulgences), viz., in *kamma*, (deed), *bhassa* (desultory talks), *niddā* (sleep) and *saṅganikā* (frequenting societies) lead to the fall of a *samayavimutta-bhikkhu*. Buddhaghosa infers from the discussion that the opponents assert that the arhats retrogress up to the Sotāpattiphala but no further and that the retrogression happens only in the sphere of *Kāmaloka* and not in the higher two spheres, *Rūpa* and *Arūpa*, and that also is confined only to the *mudindriya* or *samayavimutta* arhats.

The *Kathāvatthu* refers to another cause for the fall of an *arhat, viz.*, (i) *kammahetu arahā arahattā parihāyati* (an opinion of the Pubbaseliyas and Sammitīyas). It means that the fall of an arhat is sometimes due to the deeds of his previous lives, e.g. of having calumniated an *arhat*. It also warns the opponents particularly the Pubba- and Apara-seliyas and Uttarāpathakas about impostors passing as an arhat and committing *abrahmacariya* offences (vide *Kvu.*, II. 1 & XXIII. 2).

Re. Anuśaya (Dormant passion):

(i) *Anusayā anārammaṇā* and *citta-vippayuttā* (IX. 4) (Dormant passions are not objects of thought and are dissociated from mind).

1. By *Samayavimutta* is meant those arhats whose faculties are not very strong; according to the Theravādins these arhats complete their meditational course but have not attained complete self control.

This opinion is the same as that of the Śaila schools, so it has been discussed along with their other views (see *infra.*) (cf. *Koṣa,* transl., V, p. 4-5).

Re. Viññāṇa (Perception):

(i) *Pañcaviññāṇasamaṅgissa atthi maggabhāvanā* (X. 3) (Inspite of the perceptions through the organs of sense, a person may progress along the spiritual path). (ii) *Pañcaviññāṇā kusalā ti akusalā pī ti* (X. 4) and (iii) *Pañcaviññāṇā sābhogā* (X. 5) (The five sense-perceptions may be good or bad and are "co-ideational" (*sābhogā,* lit., are associated with mental enjoyment).

The Mahāsaṅghikas on the basis of the statement of Bhagavā, *"Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu cakkhunā rūpaṃ disvā nimittaggāhī hoti...pe...na nimittaggāhī hoti...pe...sotena saddaṃ sutvā etc.,"* contend that a person using the five sense-organs may practise *maggabhāvanā,*[1] by not grasping the object seen or heard (*nimittaggāhī*) and directing his mind towards *nibbāna.* The Theravādins argue that if through pañcaviññāṇa one attains sotāpatti and other maggas, then the *pañcaviññāṇā* and *magga* should be of the same category, but the former is *lokiya* and the latter *lokuttara,* the former is *savatthuka* (have an object as basis) and the latter is *avatthuka* (without any basis). In this way the Theravādins argue that by the exercise of the five viññāṇas one does not attain nibbāna.

The opponents state that through the use of five viññāṇas a person may engender *rāga* (attachment) is self-evident though the Theravādins may not admit that the five perceptions are *sābhogā* (X. 5). In the discussion (VIII. 4) whether the five *āyatanas* are associated with desires (*kāma*), the Theravādins

1 Meditational practices which lead to the attainment of the four *maggas,* viz., sotāpatti, sakadāgāmi, anāgāmi and arahatta.

acknowledge that Buddha said that the five *āyatanas* may or may not be *kāmaguṇas,* and explained the same by saying that a person's organs of sense or the objects of the senses are not by themselves *kāmaguṇas* (associated with desires) but one, who has *saṃkappārāga* (desireful intention) and does not dissociate his mind from the objects of sense, is not expected to attain detachment from worldly objects.[1] The Mahāsaṅghikas, I think, hold the identical opinion though it is not so clearly expressed in Vasumitra, it is only the Sarvāstivādins who held the opinion that the vijñānas conduce to *sarāga* and not to *virāga* (Masuda, p. 48).

Re. Indriyas (Organs of sense):

Cakkhunā rūpaṃ passatī ti (*Kvu.* xviii. 9). Sentient surface of the eyes see).[2]

In the *Kathāvatthu* (xviii, 9), the Mahāsaṅghikas are said to hold the opinion that the organs of sense perceive and not their perceptive faculty (*vijñāna*). This is also the view of the Vaibhāṣikas (vide *Kośa,* transl. i. p. 81-2). The Śaila schools and the Theravādins hold the opposite view (see *infra*).

Re. Anupubbābhisamaya (Gradual realisation of the truths):

The Mahāsaṅghikas like the Theravādins hold that the realisation of the truths takes place all at once and not gradually (for the contrary opinion of the Sarvāstivādins,[3] see *infra*).

1 Quoted in the *Kvu.,* p. 370 from the *Aṅg. Nik.,* III, 411.

2 The eyes see and not the cakṣu-vijñāna is also the opinion of the Vaibhāsikas (*Kośa.* i. 81-2). See *Infra.*

3 *Kośa* (transl.), vi, p. 185 fn.

Re. Apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha (Emancipation without knowledge):

The Buddhists admit two kinds of *nirodha* one attained by means of knowledge (*pratisaṃkhyā*) and the other by complete removal of all impurities which cause rebirth, and not by knowledge (*apratisaṃkhyā*). The Mahāsaṅghikas hold that the latter is *paścād abhāva* (subsequent absence) of *dharmas* in virtue of their spontaneous destruction, which are not reborn.[1]

Re. Kleśa-bīja (Germ of impurities):

The Mahāsaṅghikas state that *kleśa-bīja* is a *dharma* distinct from *kleśa* (*Kośa*, v. p. 7).

Re. Reals:

The Mahāsaṅghikas maintain as against the Sarvāstivādins that the present exists but not the past and future.

Re. Vijñapti (Signs of intimation):

The Mahāsaṅghikas hold that *vijñapti* is also an act (*Kośa*, iv, p. 3). (Cf. p. 71).

Other opinions:

The following are some of the doctrines attributed to the Mahāsaṅghikas in the *Kathāvatthu* only:—

(i) Restraint (*saṃvara*) or unrestraint (*asaṃvara*) of the organs of sense should be treated as action (*kamma*).[2] The Theravādins regard it as non-action, their contention being that an action should be defined as the actual functioning of the five organs of sense initiated by mind (*cetanā*). *Kvu.* XII. 1.

(ii) All actions (*sabbaṃ kammaṃ*) are accompanied by results (*savipāka*). The Theravādins contend that as *cetanā* is the

1 *Kośa* (transl.), ii, p. 280. 2 Cf. *Kośa*, (trasl.), iv, p. 52.

source of all actions,[1] and as there are *avyākata* (neither good nor bad) and *avipāka* (unaccompanied by any result) *cittas*,[2] there must be also avyākata and avipāka kammas, hence all actions are not necessarily accompanied by results.—*Kvu.* XII. 2.

(iii) Sound and other āyatanas (spheres of the organs of sense) are also results of actions (*kammassa katattā uppannaṃ*). In short, all non-materials (*arūpadhammā*) are products of actions (*kammasamuṭṭhānā*).—*Kvu.*, XII. 3 & 4.[3]

(iv) Acquisition of moral purity is not mental (*sīlam acetasikan ti; sīlaṃ na cittānuparivattī ti*). *Kvu.* X. 7. 8.

The Mahāsaṅghikas imply by the above opinion of theirs that purity in speech (sammā vācā), actions (sammā kammanta) and means of livelihood (sammā ājīva) is a corporeal property and as such is non-mental and requires no ārammaṇa (basis).[4] The M. mean that the observance of sīlas transforms the bodily constituents of a being in such a way that it can no longer commit any wrong, i.e., cannot be *dussīla*.

(v) The collection of sīlas (merits) is not associated with mind. (*cittavippayuttaṃ sīlopacayaṃ*). *Kvu.* X. 9.

Buddhaghosa explains this is due to misapprehension of the sense of the passage in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* (I. p. 33): *ārāmaropā vanaropā ye janā...tesaṃ sadā puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati* (the merits of those who plant park and woods increase at all times).

(vi) *Maggasamaṅgissa rūpaṃ maggo ti.*[5] *Kvu.* X. 2.

(vii) *Maggasamaṅgī dvīhi sīlehi samannāgato ti.*[6] *Kvu.* X. 6.

1 Cetanāhaṃ kammam vadāmi—*Atthas.*, p. 135.

2 See *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, pp. 87 ff. 3 Cf. *Kośa*, (trasl.), i, p. 69-70.

4 *Kvu.* I, p. 422. See p. 21, re. Anusaya.

5 Transl. "That the physical frame of one who is practising the eightfold path is included in that path." *Points of Controversy*, p. 244.

6 Transl. "That one who is engaged in the path is practising a

A maggasamaṅgī is an advanced adept who has reached one of the maggas, i.e., sotāpattimagga, etc., by following the eight-fold path, and is engaged in *maggabhāvanā* (higher meditations). His mental states are transcendental (lokuttara). The question is whether the sīla practices[1] completed by him in the pre-sotāpanna stage and still possessed by him should be regarded as lokuttara or lokiya (belonging to the spheres of Kāma, Rūpa and Arūpa)? The M. contend that the rūpa of a maggasamaṅgī (or maggaṭṭha) remains lokiya while his mental state (citta) becomes lokuttara, hence his sīlas, which belong to the category of rūpa as shown above, remain lokiya. Of the eight factors of the aṭṭhaṅgika-magga, three, *viz.*, sammā vācā, kammanta and ājīva of a sotāpanna are sīlas and as such they are lokiya but the remaining five which are mental (arūpa) may be lokuttara. A sotāpanna therefore is in possession of lokiya sīlas but if he practises sammāsati, sammāvāyama, etc. he may be said to have lokuttara-sīlas. The Th. do not make any such distinction, for, all the eight sīlas, according to them, emanate from mind;[2] so the sīlas of a sotāpanna, who has lokuttara-citta, are lokuttara.

(viii) Acts of intimation are virtues (*viññatti sīlan ti*).

(ix) Acts not intimating a moral purpose is immoral[3] (*aviññatti dussīlyan ti*). *Kvu*. X. 10, 11.

double morality." *Ibid.*, p. 248. *Vism.*, p. 6: Sīlena sotāpanna-sakadāgāmibhāvassa kāraṇaṃ pakāsitaṃ hoti. Sotāpanno hi sīlesu paripūrakāri ti vutto, tathā sakadāgāmī.

1 See *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, p. 60.

2 Cf. *Vism.*, p. 6: Kiṃ sīlan ti? Cetanā sīlaṃ, cetasikaṃ sīlam, saṃvara sīlaṃ, avītikkamo sīlan ti (quoted from *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, I, p. 44).

3 See *Points of Controversy*, p. 252. For definition of *Viññatti*, see *Atthas.*, pp. 83 ff.

Sīla, according to the M., must be positive action and not mere restraint (saṃvara), so any *viññatti* (intimation) by means of body or speech is sīla. Salutation, rising to welcome, folding hands, etc., are sīlas. The M., in view of their opinion that there may be accumulation of demerits without the association of mind (*cittavippayuttaṃ apuññupacayaṃ*), contend "that acts not intimating a moral purpose are immoral."

(x) Insight is dissociated from mind (*ñāṇam cittavippayuttaṃ*). *Kvu.* XI. 3.

(xi) One should not be called 'ñāṇī' (possessed of insight) though his *aññāṇa* (spiritual ignorance) is gone but his thoughts are not conjoined with insight. (*Aññāne vigate ñāṇavippayutte citte vattamāne na vattabbaṃ 'ñāṇī' ti*). *Kvu.* XI. 2.

In this controversy *ñāṇa* means maggañāṇa (insight belonging to the adepts who are in one of the four maggas). The M. contend that at the moment when an adept has cakkhuviññāṇa, etc., he cannot have maggañāṇa. In other words they mean to say that it is only when an adept develops maggañāṇa and stops his sense perceptions (viññāṇas), he may be described as 'ñāṇī', hence ñāṇa is not associated with mind (citta = viññāṇa).

(xii) *Akusalamūlaṃ paṭisandahati kusalamūlan ti.*[1] *Kvu.* XIV. 1.

The M. contend that as the same object may be the cause of both *rāga* (attachment) and *virāga* (detachment) and as one may follow the other immediately, it may be stated that kusala is the *anantarapaccaya* (contiguous cause) of akusala and *vice versa*. The Th. point out that cultivation of kusalamūla must be made deliberately (yoniso manasikaroto) while that of akusalamūla does not require any such thinking (ayoniso manasikaroto),

1 "That a basis of bad thought is consecutive to a basis that is good, and conversely." *Points of Controversy*, p. 282.

and also that *nekkhammasaññā* (renunciating thought) does not always follow *kāmasaññā* (worldly thought) and *vice versa,* and so kusalamūla cannot be regarded generally as the contiguous cause of akusalamūla and *vice versa.*[1]

(xiii) *Paccayatā vavatthitā ti.* (One phenomenon can be related to another in one way only). *Kvu.* XV. 1.

The M. now enter into the problem of *paccayas.* There are twenty-four kinds of paccayas, viz., hetu, ārammaṇa, adhipati, sahajāta, anantara, etc.[2] They raise the question whether one object can be placed under two or more kinds of paccayas of another object, or one can be related to another by one relation only. The Th. hold that one object may be two kinds of paccayas, e.g., *viriya* may be both *adhipati* and *sahajāta; vimaṃsā* may be both *hetu* and *adhipati.* The M. do not subscribe to this view.

(xiv) *Avijjā paccayā pi saṃkhārā, na vattabbaṃ "saṃkhārā paccayā pi avijjā ti."*[3] *Kvu.* XV. 2.

This view of the M. is only a corollary to the previous one. The M. hold that avijjā is the *hetu* (cause) of saṃkhārā and as such there cannot be any other relation between the two. The Th., however, argue that avijjā and saṃkhārā are related to each other both as hetu and sahajāta (co-existent) or aññamañña (reciprocal), hence it may be stated that saṃkhārā are sahajāta-paccayā of avijjā, and *vice versa.*[4] In the *Vibhaṅga* (pp. 156 ff.)

1 Cf. *Tikapaṭṭhāna,* pp. 168 ff.

2 See *Atthas.,* p. 9; *Dukapaṭṭhāna,* p. 3; *Points of Controversy,* App., pp. 390-2; *Buddhist Psychology,* pp. 194 ff.

3 "That whereas actions are conditioned by ignorance, we may not say that ignorance is conditioned by actions." *Points of Controversy,* p. 294.

4 Cf. *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, p. 54-55: avijjā samudayā āsavā

the sampayutta (associated) and aññamañña (reciprocal) relations between any two consecutive links of the chain of causation are exhaustively dealt with, showing clearly the attitude of the Theravādins to the problem.

(xv) *Lokuttarānaṃ dharmāṇaṃ jarāmaraṇaṃ lokuttaraṃ* (XV. 6) (decay and death of supramundane beings or objects are also supramundane).

(xvi) *Paro parassa cittaṃ niggaṇhāti* (XVI. 1).

The Mahāsaṅghikas hold that the spiritually advanced monks develop the power of controlling others' thoughts.

(xvii) *Iddhibalena samannāgato kappaṃ tiṭṭheyya* (XI. 5).

On the basis of Buddha's statement that those who have mastered *iddhipāda* (higher powers) may live for an aeon if he so wishes,[1] the Mahāsaṅghikas state that by means of higher attainments one can extend his life up to a kalpa.[2]

āsavasamudayā avijjā; also *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, p. 56-57: viññāṇapaccayā nāmarūpam, nāmarūpapaccayā viññāṇan ti.

1 See *infra*, p. 77, n. 4.

2 Cf. *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, p. 117.

CHAPTER VIII (B)

DOCTRINES OF GROUP II SCHOOLS

The Śaila Schools, Prajñaptivādins, Bahuśrutīyas and Vetulyakas

In discussing the doctrines of the Śaila and other schools, Vasumitra has mixed them up with the Mahāsaṅghikas, probably with that section of the Mahāsaṅghikas who are distinguished in the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* as *ekacce Mahāsaṅghikā*. It is on the basis of the *Kathāvatthu* that we have distinguished the doctrine of the later Mahāsaṅghikas, whose opinion may be taken as identical with those of the Śaila and other schools and put them together in the following pages.

I. *Is Buddha human?*

In Vasumitra's treatise the Buddhas are described as *lokottara* (supramundane), and as such he is made of *anāsrava dharmas*[1] (pure qualities, without sleep or dream which are concomitants of *sāsrava dharmas*). Buddhas have unlimited *rūpakāyas* (material bodies), powers (*balas*), length of life (*āyu*), etc.

1 Masuda renders it as "no sāsrava dharmas." The rendering, I would prefer, is "anāsrava dharmas," i.e. Buddhas are embodiment of anāsrava dharmas, viz., sīlaskandha, samādhisk., prajñāsk., vimuktisk. and vimuktijñānadarśanask. not of rūpa, vedanā, saññā, saṅkhārā and viññāṇa which are sāsrava dharmas. See my *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relation to Hīnayāna* (henceforth indicated as *Aspects*), p. 108.

In the *Kathāvatthu* (XVII. 1 & 2) the above doctrines are attributed to the Vetulyakas, according to whom the Buddha does not live in the world of men neither should he be located anywhere and it is his created form (*abhinimmito jino*) that delivered the religious discourses. The Theravādins account for this heresy by saying that it is due to the literal but wrong interpretation of the passage: *Bhagavā loke jāto loke sambuddho lokaṃ abhibhuyya viharati anupalitto lokenā ti* (Buddha, born and enlightened in this world, overcame this world and remained untouched by the things of the world—*Saṃ. Nik.*, iii. 140). This is supplemented by further discussions in the *Kvu.*, (XVIII. 1, 2 & XXI. 6) relating to the heresies also attributed to the Vetulyakas, viz., *Na vattabbaṃ, "Buddho Bhagavā manussaloke aṭṭhāsī" ti* (It should not be said that Buddha lived in the world of men—XVIII. 1); *Sabbā disā Buddhā tiṭṭhantī ti*[1] (Buddhas exist in all corners of the world— XXI. 6) and *Abhinimmitena desito ti* (the discourses are delivered by created forms—XVIII. 2). These show that according to the opponents of the Theravādins the Buddha is omnipresent and as such is beyond the possibility of location in any particular direction or sphere and that all the preaching of Buddhism has been done by the apparitional images of Buddha.

Buddhaghosa with his usual naïvety understood the Vetulyakas as holding the opinion that Buddha remained always in the Tusita heaven, where he was before he came to this world. The discussions in the *Kathāvatthu* as also the terse statements of Vasumitra leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Mahāsaṅghikas (specially their offshoots,—the Vetulya-

1 This is the opinion of the Mahāsaṅghikas only according to the *Kvu.*

kas and the Lokottaravādins) regarded Buddha as transcendental. Masuda suggests that the *sambhogakāya* of Buddha is referred to in the heresies, but the time of emergence of the conception of *sambhogakāya* is still a matter of controversy.[1] From the discussion in the *Kathāvatthu* (XXI. 5) concerning "*atthi Buddhānaṃ Buddhehi hīnātirekatā ti* (whether Buddhas mutually differ?) it seems that the Andhakas (another offshoot of the Mahāsaṅghikas) were still concerned with the *Sambhoga-kāya* and had not yet arrived at the conception of the *Dharma-kāya*. Buddhaghosa says that the Andhakas hold that Buddhas differ from one another in some qualities other than attainments like *satipaṭṭhāna, sammāppadhāna,* etc., the orthodox school holding that Buddhas may differ in respect of *sarīra* (body), *āyu* (length of life) and *pabhāva* (radiance) but not in regard to the attainments mentioned above. The discussion in the *Kvu.* (XVIII. 3) shows that the Uttarāpathakas held the views that Buddhas can have no *karuṇā* (compassion), and that Buddha's body is made of *anāsrava dharmas*. In the *Mahāvastu* (I, p. 167-8) the conception of *lokottara* Buddha appears thus:—Transcendental are the practices of Bhagavān, and so are his *kuśalamūlas*, his eating, drinking and such other daily actions. He follows the ways of the world just as much as he follows the transcendental ways.[2] He makes a show of standing, walking and other *iriyāpathas*, but he never gets tired. He washes his feet or body though there is no dirt to wash; he cleanses his teeth

1 Masuda's opinion, however, can be supported by the fact that in the *Mahāvastu* (I, p. 169) Buddha's *kāya* is equated to *niṣyandakāya* rendered into Chinese by *pao sheng* which is also the rendering of *sambhogakāya*, see my *Aspects*, pp. 117, 120.

2 *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 168: लोकानुवर्तनां बुद्धा अनुवर्तन्ति लौकिकीं ।
प्रज्ञप्तिमनुवर्तन्ति यथा लोकोत्तरामपि ॥

though his mouth smells like a lotus;[1] he eats though he has no hunger, and so forth. These are all due to his being an embodiment of the effects of good actions.[2] There is nothing in common between Him and the beings of the world. Everything of the great *ṛṣi* is transcendental including his advent into the world.[3]

If the transcendence of Buddha be admitted, then it follows as a matter of course that his length of life would be unlimited and that he could not be subject to sleep or dream, as he could have no fatigue, and one who is without sleep and ever awake has nothing to do with dream. It is worth noting here that even in the Pāli *suttas* like the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*[4] there are hints to the effect that a Buddha, if he wishes, can extend his life-limit up to a *Kalpa* or the end of a *Kalpa* thus revealing that the transcendental conception has taken roots in the minds of the Buddhists at a very early date.

In the *Kathāvatthu*[5] the discussion resting with the topic: *Buddhassa Bhagavato vohāro lokuttaro ti* reveals that the Andhakas, to whom the above opinion is ascribed, held that Buddha's actions (*vohāro*) are *lokuttara* and that they are treated as *lokiya* (mundane) and *lokuttara* (supramundane) according as the object of the action is *lokiya* or *lokuttara*. Mr. Shwe Zan Aung prefers to confine the sense of the word "*vohāro*"[6] to

1 Cf. *Kvu.* XVIII. 4: Buddhassa Bhagavato uccārapassāvo ativiya aññe gandhajāte adhigaṇhātīti—opinion of some Andhakas and Uttarāpathakas.

2 *Mtu.*, I, p. 169: बुद्धानां शुभनिष्यन्दानां एषा लोकानुवर्तना । Cf. *Laṅkā*, pp. 28, 34: निष्यन्दबुद्धा ।

3 *Mtu.*, I, p. 159.

4 *Dīgha*, II, p. 103: yassa kassaci cattāro iddhipādā bhāvitā—so ākaṅkhamāno kappaṃ vā tiṭṭheyya kappāvasesaṃ vā.

5 *Kvu.*, II, 10.

6 Sans. *Vyavahāra*.

"speech", and we think there is good reason for it.[1] In Vasumitra's treatise an opinion of this nature is attributed to the Mahāsaṅghikas in contrast to the Sarvāstivādins, viz., the *sūtras* (or discourses) preached by the Buddha are all perfect in themselves (*nītārtha*). Buddhas speak of nothing but *dharma* (doctrines), as such their teaching is concerned only with *paramārthasatya* (*paramatthasacca*), i.e., not with *saṃvṛtisatya* (*sammutisacca*).[2] The *paramārthasatya* cannot be normally expressed by words. It can be explained only by silence or at the most by an exclamation—which idea, I think, is expressed in Vasumitra's treatise thus: "The Buddha can expound all the doctrines with a single utterance and that there is nothing which is not in conformity with the truth in what has been preached by the World-honoured one."[3] In the *Upāyakauśalyaparivarta* of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* it has been shown that for training up deluded beings in his doctrines, Buddha did take recourse to various expedients which were false, i.e., unreal (*saṃvṛti* or *sammuti*), and that through such teachings he led the deluded beings to the truth—*paramārtha*. So it follows that all his teachings collected in the *Piṭakas* are merely *saṃvṛti* or *sammuti* (unreal) and hence they are not his real teachings.[4]

According to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Vasumitra says, Buddhas have both *kṣayajñāna* and *anutpādajñāna*[5] always present in their

1 Cf. *M.Vṛ.*, p. 494. व्यवहारमनाश्रित्य परमार्थो न देश्यते ।

2 *Paramārtha-satya* means the highest truth while *saṃvṛti-satya* means the so-called truths as used in every day usage by the people in general. For detailed treatment see my *Aspects*, pp. 216 ff.

3 *Asia Major*, II, p. 19.

4 *Aspects*, p. 198.

5 Masuda, pp. 21, 42.

(a) *Kṣayajñāna* means cognizance of the fact that all the *āsavas* are destroyed;

mind, the Sarvāstivāda holding that all Arhats may have *kṣaya-jñāna* but a few only have *anutpādajñāna;* the Theravādins, however, do not make such a distinction.

Among the other attributes of this *lokottara* Buddha, Vasumitra's treatise speaks of his powers (*balas*)[1] as unlimited while the *Mahāvastu* of his five eyes (*cakṣus*)[2] as uncommon

(b) *Anutpādajñāna* means cognizance of the fact that one will not be reborn again, Cf. *Kośa*, VI, 67; *Atthasālini*, p. 54. Cf. *Aspects*, p. 106 fn. 1.

1 The ten balas are,—

(*Mahāvastu*, pp. 159-160).	(*Kathāvatthu* and *Majjhima Nikāya*).
स्थानास्थानं वेत्ति	1. *Ṭhānāṭhānaṃ jānāti....*
सर्वत्रगामिनीं च प्रतिपदं वेत्ति	2. *Sabbatthagāminipaṭipadam jānāti.*
नानाधातुकं लोकं विदन्ति	3. *Anekadhātuṃ nānādhātuṃ lokaṃ jānāti.*
अधिमुक्तिनानात्वं वेत्ति	4. *Sattānaṃ nānādhimuttikataṃ jānāti.*
परपुरुषचरितकुशलानि वेत्ति	5. *Parasattānaṃ parapuggalānaṃ indriya-paropariyattaṃ yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti.*
6. कर्मबलं प्रतिजानन्ति शुभाशुभम्	6. *Atītānāgatāpaccuppannānaṃ hetuso vipākaṃ jānāti.*
7. क्लेशव्यवदानं वेत्ति ध्यानसमापत्तिं वेत्ति	7. *jhānavimokkhasamādhisamāpattīnaṃ saṅkilesaṃ vodānaṃ voṭṭhānaṃ yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti.*
8. पूर्वनिवासं वेत्ति	8. *anekavihitaṃ pubbenivāsaṃ anussarati.*
9. परिशुद्धदिव्यनयना भवन्ति	9. *dibbena cakkhunā satte passati cavamāne upapajjamāne etc.*
10. सर्वक्लेशविनाशं प्राप्नोति	10. *āsavānaṃ khayā anāsavaṃ cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ diṭṭhe va dhamme sayaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharati.*

2 By eyes, the text means all the five, viz., *māṃsacakṣu*, *divyac.*, *prajñāc.*, *dharmac.*, and *buddhac.*

(*asādhāraṇa*) and excelling those of *Pratyekabuddhas, Arhats* and others. This particular topic—*tathāgatabalaṃ sāvakasādhāraṇaṃ ti* has been taken up for discussion in the *Kathāvatthu* (III. 1), but strangely enough the position taken by the compiler of the *Kathāvatthu* is not that of a Theravādin but of a Lokottaravādin Mahāsaṅghika as against the Andhakas, *i.e.*, the Śaila schools. In Vasumitra's treatise this topic appears in a slightly different form.

The Theravādins do not regard Buddha as *lokottara* but attribute to him almost all the powers and qualities of a *lokottara* Buddha and this discussion reveals one of such instances. The ten special *balas* (powers) of a Tathāgata appear not only in the *Mahāvastu* (i, pp. 159-160) but also in old Pāli works like the *Majjhima Nikāya* (i, pp. 69 ff.). The contention of the Andhakas is that there is a certain degree of difference between the Buddhas and the Arhats regarding the acquisition of the ten *balas*, and as such, Buddhas and Arahats are not on the same level (*asādhāraṇaṃ*). In the *Mahāvastu* and the Pāli works this view is accepted with this reservation that Buddhas are *sarvākārājña*, i.e., they possess a complete and detailed knowledge of everything, while an Arhat can at the utmost have sectional knowledge.[1] The Pāli school, i.e., the Theravādins hold that as far as *vimutti* is concerned there is no difference between a Buddha and an Arhat, and that Buddhas are superior to the Arhats only on account of the fact that the

1 Cf. *Kvu. Cy.*, p. 62: Ṭhānāṭhānādini hi sāvakā *padesena* jānanti. Tathāgatā *nippadesena* iti. Tāni uddesato sādhāraṇāni; niddesato asādhāraṇāni—niddesato *sabbākāravisayataṃ* saṃdhāya paṭikkhipati. Cf. *Mtu.*, I, p. 158: बोधिमूलमुपगम्य चामामायां सर्वाकारज्ञतायां पंचचक्षुः समन्वागता भवन्ति। Cf. *Aspects*, p. 106 fn. 1.

former are promulgators of a new law while the Arhats are only followers of the same.[1]

II. *Are Bodhisattvas average beings?*

If, according to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Buddhas are *lokottara,* and if the Buddhas, we *puthujjanas* know of, are only created forms of the real Buddha, the Bodhisattvas also cannot be average human beings—they must also be suprāmundane. In Vasumitra's treatise the following account of the Bodhisattvas is given: The Bodhisattvas do not pass through the embryonic stages. They assume the form of white elephants when they enter their mothers' wombs and come out of the same by the right side. The above opinion is the natural outcome of the legendary belief that came to be woven around the person of the great man about a century after his actual existence. In the *Lalitavistara,*[2] the Bodhisattva is placed not only in a crystal casket put within the womb but while in that state he is said to be preaching his *dharma* to the heavenly beings that flocked around him. The stories of the white elephant seen by Māyā in a dream at the time of her conception and the birth of the Bodhisattva by bursting through the right side of the mother's womb are too well-known to need any comment. The incorporation of these legends in the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas shows that the Bodhisattva conception of the Mahāyānists was yet in the course of development.

The only doctrine that can be described as Mahāyānic is that Bodhisattvas take birth out of their own free will in any form of existence for imparting Buddhist dharmas to the sentient

1 This argument is adduced in the *Kvu.* See also *Sam. Nik.*, III, p. 66.

2 *Lalitavistara*, ch. VI, p. 73 (of A.S.B. edition).

beings of that particular form of existence[1] an idea well illustrated in the *Jātakas,* and developed in the later Mahāyāna works like the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the *Bodhicaryāvatāra.* This topic has been taken up for discussion in the *Kathāvatthu* (XXIII. 3): *Bodhisatto issariyakāmakārikahetu vinipātaṃ gacchatī ti*—but the arguments put forward completely ignore the standpoint of the Mahāsaṅghikas and attempt to show the untenability of the opponent's proposition by treating the Bodhisattva as nothing but an average human adept toiling along the path towards the attainment of *bodhi.*

In the *niyāmokkantikathā*[2] (*Kvu.,* IV. 8, XII. 5, 6 XIII. 4) the same attitude is taken by the Theravādins. By *niyāma,* the Theravādins understand *sammattaniyāma* and *micchattaniyāma,* the former being the practice of *brahmacariya* (purity in conduct) and *ariyamagga* (path of sanctification) including, for the Bodhisattvas, the fulfilment of pāramis, leading to nibbāna (i.e. *samyaktva* or *sammatta*), and the latter the commission of heinous crimes (*anantarīyakamma*) leading to hell (i.e., *mithyātva* or *micchatta*), all other practices being looked upon as *aniyata* (un-predestined).[3] In the sense as expressed above any Śrāvaka can be a *sammattaniyāma* and he need not be a bodhisattva. The Theravādins do not recognise the bodhisattvas as superior in attainments to the Śrāvakas, and in the matter of *brahmacariya* and practice of *ariyamagga* they do not want to make any distinction between a Śrāvaka and a Bodhisattva.

In the *Laṅkāvatāra* and Asaṅga's *Sūtrālaṅkāra* and such other Mahāyāna works however it is repeatedly stated that a

1 Masuda, p. 21.

2 Stepping into the path destined to reach Nibbāna.

3 *Kvu.,* pp. 78, 143: *Ime dve niyāme ṭhapetvā añño niyāmo nāma natthi.*

person by the development of *bodhicitta* becomes a *niyata* Bodhisattva, i.e., through the fulfilment of *pāramis* and practice of the various forms of asceticism he is to become ultimately a Buddha. Siddhārtha Gautama, in one of his previous births as Jotipāla-māṇava, did, as a matter of fact, develop *bodhicitta* at the time of Kassapa Buddha and then through several births, he fulfilled the pāramis and took recourse to all possible *sādhanās*, whether Buddhistic or non-Buddhistic and ultimately attained perfection. He even became disciples of Āḷāra Kālāma and Rudraka Rāmaputta whose doctrines are treated as heresies in the *Brahmajāla* and other *suttas*. In the Mahāyāna texts emphasis is laid more on *bodhicitta* than on *brahmacariya* and *ariyamagga*. In the *Kathāvatthu* discussion, the Mahāyānic sense of *niyata* is ignored and the Theravāda sense of *sammattaniyāma* is kept in view. In the *Kathāvatthu* (XIII. 4) it is argued that to speak of a *niyata śrāvaka* or *bodhisattva* to have become a *sammatta*[1] is illogical. The difference of opinion really rests on the interpretation given to the word *niyata* in Mahāyāna texts as against that given by the *Kathāvatthu* writer and commentator. Inspite of the above interpretation of *niyāma* and attitude of the Theravādins they contend that Gautama Buddha in his bodhisattva existence did not become a disciple (śrāvaka) of Kassapa Buddha. In support of their contention they cited the passage: *na me ācariyo atthi, sadiso me na vijjati* etc. The Andhakas, strangely enough, took the opposite view and asserted that he did become a śrāvaka of Kassapa Buddha and cited the passage from the *Majjhima Nikāya* (ii, p. 54): *Kassapo, ahaṃ Ānanda bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ acariṃ sambodhāyā ti* etc.[2]

1 *Na niyatassa niyāmokkamanaṃ tasmā asādhakan ti* *Kvu. A.*, p. 143.

2 *Kvu.*, p. 288.

According to the Theravādins, the Bodhisattvas as a class of beings as envisaged in the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* and *Laṅkāvatāra* do not exist. The individual, who happens to become the Buddha, is called a bodhisattva in his previous existence just to distinguish him as a being superior to an average one; by calling him a bodhisattva the Theravādins do not attribute to him any special virtues unattainable by a śrāvaka. The Mahāsaṅghikas or the Andhakas do not subscribe to the above view. According to them an individual from the moment he develops *bodhicitta* becomes a *bodhisatta* and is destined (*niyata*) to become a Buddha and follows a career which is quite different from that of a *śrāvaka*. The career of the former is marked more by love and compassion for the suffering beings than by path-culture while that of the latter has more of path-culture and *sādhanā* than exercise of *mettā* and *karuṇā*.

III. *Are Arhats fully emancipated?*

According to Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva, the secession of the Mahāsaṅghikas from the Theravādins happened on account of the five points of Mahādeva. Four of these points relate to the qualities attainable by an Arhat. According to the Theravādins only one who is fully emancipated is called an Arhat,—he is *anupatto sadattho vītarāgo vītadoso vītamoho khīṇāsavo ohitabhāro katakaraṇīyo nāparam itthattāyā ti* (in possession of the excellent goal, free from attachment, hatred and delusion, in short, all impurities, relieved of burden of khandhas, accomplished in all that is to be done and devoid of any further existence). He has further acquired the clear vision about the origin and destruction of things, got rid of all doubts (*kaṅkhā*) about the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha, non-existence of soul and the theory of causation, seen things for himself without the

help of others (*na paravitāraṇā*)[1] and attained *bodhi* which however is *catumaggaññāṇa*[2] and not *sabbaññutaññāṇa*—the *bodhi* of the Buddhas.[3] The Theravādins do not admit the failings[4] which are attributed to the Arhats by the Bahuśrutīyas, the Śaila schools and the Haimavatas. The failings are thus enumerated in Vasumitra's treatise:

(1) Arhats can be tempted by others;
(2) They have still ignorance;
(3) They have still doubt;
(4) They gain knowledge through others' (help).[5]

In the *Kathāvatthu* (II, 1-5) all the above statements are taken up for discussion and appear thus:

(*i*) *Atthi arahato rāgo?* (II. 1).[6]
(*ii*) *Atthi arahato aññāṇan*[7] *ti?* (II. 2).
(*iii*) *Atthi arahato kaṅkhā ti?* (II. 3).
(*iv*) *Atthi arahato paravitāraṇā ti?* (II. 4).

The Theravādins emphatically deny that an Arhat who is free from attachment (*vītarāga*) can be subject to temptation. The

1 See *infra*, p. 87.
2 The catumaggas are sotāpatti, sakadāgāmi, anāgāmi and arhatta.
3 See *Kvu.*, *A.*, p. 76.
4 For the discussion "Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti" see *infra*, p. 90.
5 Masuda, pp. 24, 36, 38, 53; cf. *JRAS.*, 1910, pp. 413-423. For the 5th point see *infra*, p. 87.
6 In the text the wording is "atthi arahato asucisukkavisaṭṭhi?" It perhaps refers to an instance of the Māra gods having removed *asucisukka* of an arhat. The commentator remarks that the impostors passing as arhats may have asucisukkavisaṭṭhi and upon that the contention of the Śaila schools is based. The Theravādins take their stand upon the fact an arhat cannot have rāga and hence they cannot commit asucisukkavisaṭṭhi.
7 *Aññāṇaṃ* is not the same as *avijjā*.

opponents, as shown in the *Kvu.*, draw a subtle distinction between a *Sa-(=Sans. Sva-)dhammakusala-arhat* and a *Paradhammakusala-arhat*, the former, according to the commentator, is a *Paññāvimutta* and the latter an *Ubhatobhāgavimutta*, that is, the knowledge of the former is confined to his own personal attainments while that of the latter is extended to other's attainments besides his own. In the Pāli texts the *Ubhatobhāgavimutta* is not regarded as superior to the *Paññāvimutta* the only distinction made between the two is that the former has *samathābhinivesa*[1] and realisation of eight vimokkhas[2] while the latter has *vippassanābhinivesa*[3] and realisation of only four jhānas,[4] but as far as the question of *rāga* or *āsavas* is concerned both the classes of Arhats must be regarded as completely free from them, hence the subtle distinction drawn by the opponents is of no avail according to the Theravādins.

The next two points, that an arhat may have ignorance (i.e. *aññāṇa* and not *avijjā*) and doubt (*kaṅkhā* or *vimati*) are also vehemently opposed by the Theravādins on the ground that one cannot be an arhat unless he gets rid of *avijjā* and *vicikicchā* and develops perfect vision free from impurities (*virajam vītamalaṃ dhammacakkhuṃ*) after having dispersed all his doubts (*kaṅkhā vapayanti sabbā*).

The opponents, as presented in the *Kvu.*, in this case also draw a distinction between a Sadhammakusala-arhat and a Para-

1 Samatha leads to concentration of thoughts and eradication of attachment (*rāga*). Cf. *Aṅguttara*, I, p. 61: *rāgavirāgā cetovimutti.*

2 For the eight *Vimokkhas*, see Appendix.

3 Vipassanā leads to knowledge and removal of ignorance. Cf. *Aṅguttara*, I, p. 61: *avijjāvirāgā paññāvimutti.*

4 Cf. *Aspects*, pp. 250, 276. See *Majjhima*, I, p. 477 and *Manorathapūraṇi*, III, p. 188; *Puggala-paññatti*, 14, 72.

dhamma-kusala-arhat, saying that both the classes of arhats may not have *avijjā* in regard to the truths, the theory of causation, etc. or *vicikicchā* about Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha or absence of soul, but the former may have *aññāṇa* and *kaṅkhā*, say, as regards the name and family of an unknown man or woman or of a tree. It should be noted here the opponents do not mean *sabbaññutañāṇa* (omniscience) but just *paradhammañāṇa*—an intellectual power attained by the Ubhatobhāgavimutta-arhats, by which they can know many things outside himself. Arguing in this way the opponents maintain that a section of the arhats, i.e., the Paññāvimuttas or Sa-dhammakusala-arhats have ignorance (*aññāṇa*) relating to things or qualities other than those belonging to himself.

The same arguments and counter-arguments are applied in the next discussion relating to *atthi arahato paravitāraṇā?* The word *paravitāraṇā* perplexed our translator Mr. Shwe Zan Aung.[1] The discussion in the *Kvu.* reveals that the word means that an arhat develops faith in the Triratna or acquires knowledge of the truths, etc. not by himself but through the instruction of his preceptor[1] in whom he had firm faith. The Theravādins oppose the contention of the opponents, saying that an arhat is *vītamoha* and is possessed of *dhammacakkhu* and so he does not require *paravitāraṇā*. The opponents as before contend that a sa-dhammakusala-arhat requires *paravitāraṇā* while a para-dhammakusala-arhat does not.

Another statement of Vasumitra relating to the Arhats,

1 "Excelled by others." See *Points of the Controversy*, p. 119. Buddhaghosa writes: yasmā yesaṃ tāni vatthuni pare vitaranti pakāsenti ācikkhanti tasmā tesaṃ atthi paravitāraṇā ti.

Cf. Masuda, p. 24: "gain spiritual perception by the help of others (lit. enlightenment through others)."

namely, "one who is kṛtakṛtyaḥ (=Pāli: katakaraṇīyo) does not take any dharma to himself i.e. has no attachment for worldly things" is echoed, I think, in the *Kvu*. (XVII, 1 & XXII. 2) in these terms: *atthi arahato puññopacayo ti?* and *arahā kusalacitto parinibbāyatī ti.* The Theravādins agreeing with the Mahāsaṅghikas contend that the citta of Arhats goes beyond *pāpa* and *puṇya, kusala* and *akusala, kriyā* and *vipāka,* hence, to speak of them as acquiring merits or demerits is absurd. The opponents, the *Andhakas,* however, contend that the Arhats perform many good deeds, e.g., making gifts, worshipping caityas and so forth, and remain always self-possessed (*sato sampajāno*) even at the time of his parinibbāna, and so he does collect merits and passes away with *kusalacitta.*

Neither the above discussions in the *Kathāvatthu* nor the terse statements of Vasumitra help us much in finding out the real difference between the Andhakas and the Theravādins about the position of an Arhat. The Mahāyāna works point out the distinction thus: Arhats, who are perfect Śrāvakas, get rid of only *kleśāvaraṇa,* i.e., the veil of impurities consisting of rāga, doṣa, moha, sīlabbataparāmāsa, and vicikicchā but not of *jñeyāvaraṇa,* i.e., the veil which conceals the truth—the veil which can only be removed by realising the Dharma-śūnyatā or Tathatā.[1] It is the Buddha alone who is perfectly emancipated having both *kleśāvaraṇa* and *jñeyāvaraṇa* removed. That the Mahāsaṅghikas appear to be groping to get at this clear distinction will be evident from two other topics discussed in the *Kvu.* but not referred to in Vasumitra's treatise. The topics are,—*atthi kiñci saññojanaṃ appahāya parinibbānan ti?* (XXII. 1) or *arahattappattīti?* (XXI. 3). To these the Mahāsaṅghikas replied

1 For details, see *Aspects,* pp. 35 ff.

in the affirmative, saying that an arhat is *nikkileso* (free from impurities) and does attain parinibbāna or arhatta but as he is not cognizant of all that is *Buddhavisaya* (domain of Buddha's knowledge), it must be admitted that some saññojanas are left in him. This opinion may be taken as a hint that the arhats do not remove the *jñeyāvaraṇa*.[2]

2 There are a few subsidiary discussions in the *Kathāvatthu* relating to Arhats. These are given here briefly:—

IV. 1. Householders cannot become Arhats—*Theravādins.*
But householders like Yasa, Uttiya, Setu became Arhats—*Uttarāpathakas.*

IV. 2. No one is born as Arhats—*Therav.*
But there are Upahacca-(uppajja)-parinibbāyī Arhats—*Uttarāp.*

IV. 3. All dharmas of Arhats are not anāsava, e.g. their physical body etc.—*Therav.*
But Arhats are anāsavā (free from āsavas)—*Uttarāp.*

IV. 4. In the Arhat stage, only arhattaphala is acquired—*Therav.*
But all the phalas are possessed by the Arhats—*Uttarāp.*

IV. 5. An Arhat is chaḷupekkho (see App.)—*Therav.*
Rather Arahā chahi upekkhāhi samannāgato—*Uttarāp.*

IV. 10. All saññojanas are gradually destroyed and not by Arhattamagga alone—*Therav.*
But by the destruction of all saññojanas one becomes an Arhat—*Andhakas.*

XVII. 2. Arhats may have untimely death as arahatghātaka is mentioned in the Buddhavacanas—*Therav.*
But as one cannot become an Arhat before the karmaic effects are exhausted, an Arhat cannot have untimely death—*Rājagirikas* and *Siddhatthikas.*

XVII. 3. Arhats do not die when in imperturbable meditation and devoid of kriyācitta—*Therav.*
But did not Gautama Buddha pass away immediately after arising from the 4th jhāna—*Uttarāp.*

IV. *Can there be retrogression of Arhats, Srotaāpannas and other Phalasthas?*

The following views regarding the possibility of retrogression of Arhats, Srotaāpannas and other phalasthas are attributed in Vasumitra's treatise[1] to a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and some of their sub-sects:

(i) From the gotrabhūmidharma there is in all stages the possibility of retrogression.

(ii) A Srotaāpanna has a chance of retrogression while an Arhat has not.

The above two views are discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* under the topic: *Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti?* (I. 2).

It will be observed that the *Kvu.* does not attribute to the Mahāsaṅghikas the above views about the retrogression of Arhats and Srotaāpannas. According to the Mahāsaṅghikas, the *Kvu.* says, an Arhat has retrogression while a Srotaāpanna has not, while Vasumitra takes a contrary view, as above (ii). Vasumitra says that the former opinion is held by the Sarvāstivādins and other schools. Buddhaghosa points out that this opinion is held by one section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and not all, and so Vasumitra may have in view the views "of that section, according to whom the Arhats may retrogress but the Srotaāpannas do not."[2]

All the schools advocating the view that arhats retrogress hold, as stated in the *Kvu.*, that the Sotāpannas have no retrogression. This, however, contradicts the statement of Vasumitra.[3] All these schools accept that a sotāpanno is *niyato*

1 Masuda, p. 22.

2 *Kvu. A.*, p. 35: Sammitiyā Vajjiputtiyā Sabbatthivādino ekacce ca Mahāsaṅghikā arahato parihāniṃ icchati.

3 See Masuda, II, p. 27.

sambodhiparāyaṇo and hence is not subject to retrogression, but a sakadāgāmī or an anāgāmī may retrogress but not further than the sotāpanna stage, for some of the adepts in these stages may have *anusaya* which may develop into *pariyuṭṭhāna*[1] and thus bring about the fall—an argument which will be discussed next in connection with the Aṭṭhamakas. In regard to these two stages the *Kvu.* corroborates Vasumitra's statement (no. ii).

Regarding the srotaāpannas, Vasumitra further states that:

(1) they are capable of knowing their own nature (*svabhāva*) through their *citta* and *caitasika dharmas;*
(2) they can also attain the *dhyāna;*
(3) they are liable to commit all sorts of offences except the five *anantarīyas* (i.e. matricide, patricide etc.)

In the *Kvu.* we do not come across any controversy relating to the first two topics. This silence may be interpreted as that the Theravādins accepted the two views. As regards the third topic, we may take into consideration the controversy: *Diṭṭhisampanno puggalo sañcicca pāṇaṃ jīvitā voropeyyā ti?* (see *infra*). A sotāpanna is a person with right view (*diṭṭhisampanno*), hence, according to the Theravādins, he cannot commit killing (*pāṇātipāta*) or such other offences, not to speak of the five extreme offences like matricide or patricide. Vasumitra perhaps speaks of the opinion of that section of the Mahāsaṅghikas i.e., the Andhakas, who contemplate the retrogression of the Sotāpannas while the *Kvu.* very likely speaks of the other section, according to whom the Sotāpannas do not retrogress.

1 *Anuśaya* means that which lies in the mind in a latent state with the possibility of its coming into appearance if it receives an effective impulse, while *pariyuṭṭhāna* means its actual appearance in the mind without however a corresponding response in the outer world. For further details, see p. 94f.

There are in Vasumitra's treatise two other statements, which also relate to the Srotaāpannas. They are,—

(i) When one enters into the *samyakatva-nyāma,*[1] one may be said to destroy all *saṃyojanas.*[2]

(ii) None of the *dharmāyatanas*[3] can be known or understood: they can be attained (only by those Aryan *pudgalas* above the *darśanamārga*).

The *Kvu.* contributes no discussion on the above two points. The Theravādins also cannot but subscribe to these views.

V (a). *Do the Aṭṭhamakas*[4] *have anusaya*[5] *and pariyuṭṭhāna?*

Relating to the Aṭṭhamakas, Vasumitra says that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas—

(i) In the eighth stage (aṣṭamaka-bhūmi) one can remain for a long time.

In the *Kvu.* (III. 5) the identical problem is discussed in these words:

(i) *Aṭṭhamakassa puggalassa diṭṭhipariyuṭṭhānaṃ pahīnan ti?*

Masuda's comment on the first view seems to be wide of the mark, though he quotes *'Shu-chi* as his authority. The discussion in the *Kathāvatthu* clears up the view thus:

1 See above, p. 82.

2 The three saṃyojanas are *sīlabbataparāmāsa, vicikicchā, micchādiṭṭhi.*

3 The Dharmāyatanas are *vedanā, saṃjñā,* and *saṃskārā.* Cf. *Abhi. Kośa,* p. 46.

4 The *aṭṭhamakas* are those who have just stepped into the Sotāpanna-hood, which is the eighth or the lowest stage in the fruits of sanctification.

5 For the meaning of the term and its distinction from *pariyuṭṭhāna,* see p. 91, fn. 1.

According to the *Andhakas*, an adept who is in the eighth stage i.e., sotāpatti-maggaṭṭha and not yet sotāpanna gets rid of diṭṭhipariyuṭṭhāna, sīlabbata-p. and vicikicchā-p. but not diṭṭhi-anusaya, sīlabbata-a., and vicikicchā-a., i.e., the anusayas may become active (uppajjissati) if they receive an impulse. The Andhakas by drawing this distinction between pariyuṭṭhāna and anusaya hold that an aṭṭhamaka may not get rid of the three *anusayas* and consequently remain away from the sotāpanna stage for a long time.[1]

The *Kathāvatthu* also discusses the following two allied views attributed to the Pubbaseliyas and the Uttarāpathakas:

(i) *Diṭṭhisampanno puggalo sañcicca pāṇaṃ jīvitā voropeyyā ti?* XII. 7 (Pubbaseliyas)

(ii) *Diṭṭhisampannassa puggalassa pahīnā duggatī ti?* XII. 8 (Uttarāpathakas).

By the first view the Pubbaseliyas mean that a person by having *sammādiṭṭhi* does not get rid of *dosa* (hatred), hence he can commit the sin of killing—a view wholly rejected by the Theravādins. By the second view the Uttarāpathakas assert that a person with *sammādiṭṭhi* cannot be reborn in a lower form of existence; the Theravādins point out that it may be so, but he may have *taṇhā* (desire) for objects and beings belonging to the lower forms of existences.

V (b). *Are anuśaya and paryavasthāna associated with mind or not?*

There are in Vasumitra two statements relating to *anuśaya* and *paryavasthāna*, which will clear up the above problem further.—

1 Aṭṭhamaka puggalas have saddhā but not saddhindriya—Andhaka.

(i) *Anuśayas* (dormant passions or latent bias) are neither citta nor caitasika dharmas: and again they never become the object of thought (anālambana).

(ii) *Anuśaya* is different from *paryavasthāna* (pervading passion) and *paryavasthāna* is different from *anuśaya*. It must be said that the *anuśaya* does not combine (*samprayuj*) with the citta whereas the *paryavasthāna* does.

Relating to the above topics, the *Kvu.* has,

(i) *Anusayā anārammaṇā ti?* (IX. 4) and *cittavippayuttā*
(ii) *Anusayā avyākatā ti* (XI. 1)
(iii) *Añño kāmarāgānusayo aññaṃ kāmarāgapariyuṭṭhānan ti?* (XIV. 5)
(iv) *Pariyuṭṭhānaṃ cittavippayuttan ti?* (XIV. 6)

Masuda offers the following interpretation from the *'Shu-chi*: The *anuśayas* are really *bījas* (germs inborn in the mind) of *rāga* and other passions. They remain dormant unless excited by the corresponding impulse. They remain always in the mind, even in kusalacitta, so they are dissociated from the mind and do not require any object (*ālambana*) for support. When the anuśaya is excited by a suitable impulse, it becomes paryavasthāna (pariyuṭṭhāna) and as such becomes a mental function (caitasika), and then only it becomes an impurity and clogs the way to spiritual progress. The interpretation given above is corroborated by the *Kvu. A.*[1] The Theravādins however do not distinguish between kāmarāgānusaya and kāmarāgapariyuṭṭhāna and maintain that as the anusayas are included in the Saṃkhārakkhandha, they are all sārammaṇa. But according to

1 *Kvu. A.*, p. 117: Tattha yesāṃ anusayā nāma cittavippayuttā ahetukā avyākatā ten' eva anārammaṇā 'ti laddhi seyyathā pi Andhakānañ c' eva ekaccānañ ca Uttarāpathakānaṃ.

the Andhakas some saṃkhāras are sārammaṇa (with basis) and some are anārammaṇa (without basis),[1] but not so are the remaining four khandhas. The Andhakas further maintain that as a puthujjana having kusalāvyākata-citta is sometimes described as "sānusayo ti" when their anusayas are without any ārammaṇa, it must be admitted that anusayas may be anārammaṇā.

From the above discussion it is apparent that the anusayas, according to the Andhakas, are avyākata[2] i.e. neither good nor bad, and consequently they are citta-vippayutta, and also causeless (ahetuka). The Andhakas in the third discussion assert that anusayas are different from pariyuṭṭhānas, but in the fourth the *Kvu.* makes the Andhakas contend that pariyuṭṭhānas are also cittavippayuttas, which, however, apppear to be contradictory. Vasumitra says that the pariyuṭṭhānas according to these schools are cittasampayuttas, so we must dismiss the statement of the *Kvu.* as unwarranted.

"The world in its variety originates out of actions (*karma*) which accumulate on account of *anuśayas*. In the absence of *anuśayas*, karma is not capable of producing a new existence (*punarbhava*). Consequently the root of *bhava* or rebirth is *karma*, in other words, *anuśaya*." With these words Vasubandhu opens the fifth book of *Kośa*. (See *Kośa*, V, p. 1).

The Sarvāstivādins like the Theravādins regard anuśaya, paryavasthāna and kleśa as same, the only distinction being that anuśaya is the subtle, while paryavasthāna the manifest, state of *rāga, dosa, moha*, etc.

1 *Kvu.*, p. 407: Saṃkhārakkhandho ekadeso sārammaṇo, ekadeso anārammaṇo.

2 The Andhakas, it seems, looked upon the anusayas as vipāka-citta and treated the same as avyākata. Cf. *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*.

The *Kośa* too deals with the problem under discussion, *viz.*, whether or not anuśaya (e.g. *kāmarāgānusaya*) is a dharma by itself dissociated from mind, the *prāpti* of kāmarāga, etc.? The answer of the Sarvāstivādins is in the negative as that of the Theravādins. The former quote as their authority the *Jñānaprasthāna-sūtra,* in which anuśaya is shown to be associated with mind (*cittasamprayukta*). They assert that anuśayas are kleśas, and hence they cannot but be citta-samprayuktas.

In this connection the *Kośa* refers to the opinion of the Sautrāntikas, who hold that *anuśaya* is different from *kleśa* inasmuch as it is neither associated with, nor dissociated from, mind because it is not a *dravya* apart; it is a *śakti* left in certain individuals by the previously existing kleśas and has the power of reproducing further kleśas. According to the Sautrāntikas, *kleśa* when non-manifest is *anuśaya* and when manifest, an act, it is *paryavasthāna* (*Kośa,* V, p. 7).[1]

VI. *Can the Aṭṭhamakas have Saddhindriya?*

Vasumitra does not mention this view among the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas but it is stated in the *Kvu.* that according to the Andhakas, *aṭṭhamakassa puggalassa natthi saddhindriyan ti* (III. 6), i.e., the aṭṭhamakas may develop *saddhā, viriya,* etc. but do not acquire *saddhindriya, viriyindriya* etc., a distinction which the Theravādins are not prepared to admit. The Andhakas mean that saddhindriya or viriyindriya, etc. is a faculty forming a part of the mind while saddhā or viriya etc. is only a passing phase of the mind.

1 For exhaustive treatment of Anuśayas, see La Vallée Poussin's *Abhidharmakośa,* V.

VII. *Are there worldly samyagdṛṣṭi and samyak-śraddhendriya?*

Along with the above we may discuss the allied topic worded thus in Vasumitra's treatise,—

(i) There is neither laukikasamyagdṛṣṭi (worldly right view) nor laukikaśraddhendriya (worldly faculty of faith).

The corresponding passages of the *Kvu.* are,—

(i) *Natthi puthujjanassa ñāṇan ti?* (XX, 2);[1] and

(ii) *Natthi lokiyaṃ saddhindriyan ti?* (XIX. 8).[2]

The argument of the Theravādins is that a layman may have paññā and saddhā of a kind which may be different from those of an adept, but *paññā* and *saddhā* that he possesses do develop into *paññindriya* and *saddhindriya*. It may be that the layman's paññā or ñāṇaṃ is confined to dāna, sīla, cāga, etc., i.e. lokiya affairs and does not extend to the comprehension of lokuttara subjects like truths, maggas and phalas, hence according to the Theravādins there may be lokiya paññindriya and saddhindriya.

VIII. *Is utterance of dukkha possible in meditation; and Does it help perception of the truths?*

The two statements of Vasumitra (i) "The path is realized by utterances" and (ii) "Even in the state of samāhita one can utter words" to which corresponds "*samāpannassa atthi vacībhedo ti*" of the *Kathāvatthu* are explained by Buddhaghosa thus: According to the Śaila schools an adept while in the first jhāna (meditation) and on the point of attainment of the Sotāpattimagga in some cases gives out an exclamation like "aho

1 Attributed to the Hetuvādas only.

2 Attributed in the Cy. to the Hetuvādas and Mahīśāsakas and they mean all the five indriyas, saddhā, viriya, sati, samādhi and paññā.

dukkhan ti."[1] This, the adherents of the Śaila schools account for by saying that in the first jhāna, there is *vitakkavicāra,* and because of *vitakkavicāra* there is *vacīsaṃkhārā*[2] i.e., discursive and discriminating thoughts cause vocal activity, hence there is the possibility of a meditator in the first jhāna uttering the word 'dukkha'. The Theravādins contend that as all physical activities of a meditator are set at complete rest, his giving out of an exclamation is an impossibility.[3]

Along with the above we should take into consideration the other three doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas presented thus in Vasumitra's treatise,—

(i) The words of suffering can help (the process of realization of the path);
(ii) Suffering leads a man to the path;
(iii) Suffering also is (a kind of) food (*āhāra*); and
(iv) Through *prajñā* suffering is destroyed and final beatitude is obtained.

The corresponding expressions in the *Kathāvatthu* are as follows:—

(i) *"Idaṃ dukkhan ti" vācaṃ bhāsato "idaṃ dukkhan ti" ñāṇaṃ pavattatī ti?* (XI. 4).

1 Cf. *Vinaya,* I, p. 15, in Yasapabbajjā, Upaddutaṃ vata bho upassaṭṭhaṃ vata bho.

2 Cf. *Kvu.,* IX, 9: Opinion of the Pubbaseliyas: Sabbaso vitakkayato vicārayato vitakkavipphāro saddo ti? The Cy. on it is: Yasmā vitakkavicārā vacīsaṃkhārā 'ti vuttā tasmā sabbaso vitakkayato vicārayato antamaso manodhātuppavattikale pi vitakkavipphāro saddo yevā ti. Cf. *Majjhima,* I, p. 301.

3 Cf. *Kvu.,* XVIII, 8: Samāpanno saddaṃ suṇāti ti. As it has been said by Buddha that sound is a hindrance to the first jhāna and that one rises from the first jhāna by an external sound, the Pubbaseliyas inferred therefrom that one in meditation hears sound.

(ii) *Dukhbāhāro maggaṅgaṃ maggapariyāpannan ti?* (II. 6).

Both these statements repeat in a slightly different form what has been stated by Vasumitra. The Andhakas and the Śailas hold that when a meditator realises within his innermost heart that the world is full of suffering and is not worth living, an exclamation like "aho vata dukkham"[1] spurts out of his mouth and then and there his insight (ñāṇa) penetrates into the first truth "idaṃ dukkhan ti" and as a result, he attains (*pariyāpuṇāti*) the Sotāpattimagga. So "dukkha" may be called an "āhāra" in respect of the realisation of the path as also an "aṅga" (limb) of the Sotāpattimagga.

The fourth doctrine mentioned above is, as Masuda explains, that *dukkha* can be removed not by means of the observance of moral precepts (śīlas) and practice of meditation (samādhi) but by the knowledge of the truth, causal law, and *anatta* of the things of the world. It is the basic teaching of Theravāda, hence no reference is made to it in the *Kvu*.

IX. *How Vijñānas function?*

The following opinions are attributed by Vasumitra to the Mahāsaṅghikas:

(i) Beings of the Rūpa and Arūpadhātu possess all the six sense-perceptions (ṣaḍvijñānas)[2]

(ii) The five vijñānas conduce both to attachment (*sarāga*) and freedom from attachment (virāga); and

(iii) The rūpendriyas (organs of sense) are nothing but lumps of flesh: the eyes do not see colours, the ears do not hear sounds, the nose does not smell odours,

1 See fn. 1 above.

2 Or ṣaḍvijñānakāya or the group of six sense-perceptions.

the tongue does not taste flavour, and the body does not feel touch.

The *Kvu.* deals with these topics thus:

(i) *Saḷāyataniko attabhāvo rūpadhātuyā ti?* (VIII. 7) and

(ii) *Pañc' evāyatanā kāmā ti?* (VIII. 4).

(iii) *Cakkhunā rūpaṃ passatī ti? ...pe...kayena phoṭṭhabbhaṃ phusatī ti?* (XVIII. 9).

In the discussion relating to the six āyatanas (spheres of the organs of sense), the *Kvu.* shows that the Andhakas took literally the expression: *rūpī manomayo sabbaṅgāpaccaṅgī ahīnindriyo ti* and assert that there are in the rūpadhātu all the six indriyas and āyatanas with this difference from the Kāmadhātu, that out of the six āyatanas three, viz., ghāna, rasa and phoṭṭhabba do not exist but their *nimittas,* i.e., the subtlest forms exist.[1] In the Abhidhamma texts it is stated that the denizens of the Rūpadhātu have five khandhas and six (and not twelve) āyatanas while those in the Arūpadhātu have four khandhas and two āyatanas (manāyatana and dhammāyatana only).[2]

Relating to the third point the *Kvu.* contradicts Vasumitra and says that it is the Mahāsaṅghikas who held the opposite view, viz., the eyes see colours, ears hear sounds etc. by conceiving a pasādacakkhu, a subtle eye, which has not got the power of āvajjana (reflection) like cakkhuviññāṇa but possesses just the power of knowing (paṭijānāti) objects. In this case also, shall we account for the contradictions by saying that the opinion of 'ekacce mahāsaṅghikā' is represented by Vasumitra while the opinion of the 'aññe mahāsaṅghikā' is noticed in the *Kathā-*

1 *Vibhaṅga,* p. 405: In Kāmadhātu there are cakkhāyatana and rūpāyatana, sotāyatana and saddāyatana, etc., in all, twelve āyatanas.

2 *Vibhaṅga,* pp. 405-7.

vatthu.[1] The Theravādins and a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas hold that the eyes, ears etc. are mere material conveyers of perception, the cakkhuviññāṇa, sotaviññāṇa, etc. being the actual percipients, in other words, eyes, ears etc. belong to the rūpakhandha which is material, while cakkhuviññāṇa, etc. belong to the viññāṇa-khandha, which makes a being aware of the things around him.

X. *How many avyākatas are there?*

The opinion of the Andhakas that "there is nothing which is indeterminate" (avyākṛta) has been explained by Masuda as that the Andhakas admitted only two natures of things, good or bad and not a third, neither good nor bad. This interpretation does not appear to be sound as in the Buddhist texts the three natures of things are accepted generally. The avyākatas also refer to those problems which Buddha left unanswered as any answer to them whether in the affirmative or in the negative would mislead the enquirer, or treated the question as absurd and unanswerable. These avyākata problems are always mentioned in a stereotyped form in all Buddhist texts whether Hīnayāna or Mahāyāna.[2] Nāgārjuna has utilised these problems in his *Mādhyamika-kārikā* to establish the Mahāyānic conception of Śūnyatā. If we accept Vasumitra's statement as correct, we shall have to say that the Śūnyatā conception was known to the Mahāsaṅghikas, and so to them the so-called avyākata problems were not avyākata (inexplicable), but this

1 See *infra.*

2 Sassato loko, asassato loko; antavā loko, anantavā loko; taṃ jīvaṃ taṃ sarīraṃ, aññaṃ jīvaṃ aññaṃ sarīraṃ; hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā, na hoti Tathāgato paraṃ marṇā; hoti ca na hoti caTathāgato paraṃ maraṇā, n'eva hoti na na hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā.

way of looking at the statement of Vasumitra seems to me to be too far-fetched and so, I think, Vasumitra's statement is not complete. Perhaps it refers to the problem discussed in the *Kvu.*: *diṭṭhigataṃ avyākatan ti?* (XIV. 8),—whether a person holding one of the unanswered views can be regarded as avyākata i.e. neither good nor bad. The answer of the Theravādins is that the holder of any one of the views is wrong, hence akusala and cannot be avyākata as supposed by the Andhakas and Uttarāpathakas.

XI. *How many Asaṃskṛtadharmas are there?*

In the Pāli texts, as also in the *Abhidharmakośa* (of the Sarvāstivādins) the three asaṃskṛtas are, (i) Pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha, (ii) Apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha and (iii) Ākāśa. The Andhakas increase them to nine by adding the four *āruppas*[1] and *āryamārgāṅgikatva.*[2] Excepting the *nirodha* of two kinds, all other asaṃskṛtas of the Mahāsaṅghikas are not recognised as such by the Theravādins, whose argument is whether each of these asaṃskṛtas is of the same nature as Nibbāna, if not, they are saṃskṛtas. Strangely enough the *Kvu.* goes so far as to say that ākāśa is not asaṃkhata. The attitude taken in the *Kvu.* (VI. 2, 4, 6; XIX. 3, 4) is that Nibbāna is *tānaṃ lenaṃ accutaṃ amataṃ,* (escape, refuge, infallible and immortal) so each of the seven of asaṃkhatas, even every member of the formulæ of the Paṭiccasamuppāda, each of the four phalas must be *tānaṃ*

1 The four āruppas are—
 (i) Ākāśānantāyatana.
 (ii) Vijñānānantāyatana;
 (iii) Ākiñcanyāyatana; and
 (iv) Naivasaṃjñā-nāsaṃjñāyatana.

2 Cf. *Kośa,* iii, p. 77.

lenaṃ accutaṃ amataṃ, otherwise they are saṃkhatas (constituted). The Mahāsaṅghikas interpret, as presented in the *Kvu.*, that the asaṃkhata is that which is unchangeable (aneñja) but not tānaṃ lenaṃ, etc. In regard to the causal law, they rely on Buddha's statement: *avijjā paccayā bhikkhave saṃkharā, uppādā va Tathāgatānaṃ anuppādā vā Tathāgatānaṃ thitā va sā dhātu dhammaṭṭhitatā dhammaniyāmatā idappaccayatā* etc., and point out that by asaṃkhata they do not mean the links separately but the unchangeable law (a) of the origin a thing through a cause, and (b) of the unchangeable nature of dhammas, undisturbed by appearance (uppāda) or non-appearance (anuppāda) or continuity (ṭhiti). As for the *āryamārgāṅgikatva*, the *Kvu.* explains that Pubbaseliyas regard as asaṃkhata the fact of attainment (*patti*) of a magga or phala by the removal of certain mental impurities (kilesapahānaṃ) and not the maggas or phalas by themselves. This, Vasumitra corroborates by using the term *mārgāṅgikatva* i.e. prāpti of a mārga and not simply *mārga*.[1] In the *Kvu.* there are a few other discussions relating to the asaṃkhatas to which we shall revert when dealing with the Mahīśāsakas.

XII. *Other doctrines*

The remaining three opinions of this group of schools, viz.,

(i) There is no intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*),

(ii) Phenomena exist neither in the past nor in the future, and

(iii) The nature of mind is pure in its origin: it becomes impure when it is stained by *āgantukarajas* and *upakleśas*,

1 In the *Majjhima Nikāya*, (I, p. 301) it is distinctly stated that *aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo is saṅkhato.*

are in accord with those of the Theravādins.[1] Both these schools do not admit that between death and rebirth there is any intervening period in which the subtle khandhas wait for the selection of the parents or the states of existences. The *Kvu.* says that the opinion of the opponents is formed through the miscomprehension of the meaning of the word 'antarāparinibbāyī.' We shall revert to this topic while dealing with the Sammitīyas, with whom, the commentator says, the Pubbaseliyas agreed.

As regards the opinion that the past and future exist—the cardinal doctrine of the Sarvāstivādins, to be dealt with next, both the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas are emphatic in their protest against it.

The third point raises an important problem that is to say whether the mind at the beginning was pure or not. The Theravādins are decidedly of opinion that *pubbakoṭī* (beginning) and *aparakoṭī* (end) of beings are unknowable, and as such they have not gone into the question whether the mind is pure at any time before the attainment of *vimutti*. This doctrine of the Mahāsaṅghikas obtained its full development in the idealistic philosophy of Yogācāra in which the *Ālayavijñāna* is pointed out as the storehouse of pure consciousness which gets contaminated with worldly objects through the *indriyavijñānas* and mentally creates a world around it. It is by the removal of this mental creation that a person regains the *ālayavijñāna* in its pure original form and becomes an emancipated being—a Buddha.

XIII. *Doctrines of the Śaila Schools only*

Vasumitra has attributed the following doctrines specially to the three Śaila schools:—

1 Cf. *Aṭṭhasālini,* p. 68: Cittaṃ āgantukehi upakkilesehi upakiliṭṭhaṃ.

(i) Bodhisattvas are average beings and are liable to be born in the lower states of existence.[1]

(ii) Offerings made to a caitya are not necessarily of great merit.[2]

The above dectrines are in direct contrast to those of a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Pūrvaśailas or Caityakas (see above, pp. 49, 51, 81-2). Vasumitra evidently, had in mind only the later Śaila schools, viz., Aparaśaila, Caityaśaila and Uttaraśaila and not the Pūrvaśaila.

Regarding the origin of Caityaśaila and Uttaraśaila schools, Paramārtha[3] writes that two hundred years after Buddha's *parinirvāṇa,* a second Mahādeva appeared with heretical views. He slipped into the church stealthily (i.e. became a *steyasaṃvāsika*) by ordaining himself. This event gave occasion for fresh controversies among all the branches of the Sthavira and Mahāsaṅghika schools, particularly on the question of the validity of ordination given by an ācārya, who is himself not regularly ordained. In this matter the Mahāsaṅghikas were in agreement with the Sthaviras and excommunicated Mahādeva. At this, Mahādeva got enraged and retired to another mountain and started the Caityaśaila and Uttaraśaila schools.

The Caityaśailas therefore should be distinguished from the Caityakas, who were identical with the Lokottaravādins or the Pūrvaśailas and were of earlier origin. The Caityakas and

1 See above p. 81.

2 In the *Mahāvastu* and the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscr., erection, decoration and worship of caityas find prominent place, for which I think the name Caityakas has been applied to the Pūrvaśaila school. Cf. *Kośa*, iv. 121.

3 Paul Demiéville, *L'origine des sectes bouddhiques* in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques,* vol. I, 1931-32.

Pūrvaśailas are referred to in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions, and not the later Śaila schools mentioned above.

XIV. *Nirvāṇa in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions*

In the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions, there are a few incidental remarks relating to Buddha and Nirvāṇa These probably apply to the conceptions held by the Pūrvaśailas or Caityakas. Buddha is described here as *jita-rāga-dosa-moha* (one who has conquered attachment, ill-will and delusion) and *dhātuvarapari-gahita* (possessed of the excellent *dhātu*), and the donor expects as a result of his or her gifts merits which he or she can transfer (*pariṇāmetuṃ*) to his or her relatives and friends—an article of faith not recognised in the Pāli works where *attadīpa attasaraṇa* is the maxim. The fruits expected are (i) religious merits, for himself, his relatives and friends resulting in their happiness in this world and the next (*ubhaya-loka hita-sukhāvahananāya*),—a merit which reminds us of the Aśokan inscriptions: *esa bāḍha dekhiye iyaṃ me hidatikāye iyaṃ mana me pālatikāye ti* and (ii) *Nivāṇa-sampati* (nirvāṇadom) for himself or herself.[1]

The recording of the view that gifts may bring happiness to all, but *nirvāṇa* only to oneself, deserves our careful consideration. The distinction drawn in this way is rather uncommon and is not made even in the inscription recording the gifts of the Queen of Vanavāsi to the Mahīśāsakas[2] or in the long inscription of the Sinhalese donor.[3]

Then the expressions, *dhātuvara-parigahita* or *nivāṇa-sampati-sampādaka* raise the presumption that the Andhaka-conception of Nirvāṇa was different from that of the Theravādins or their sub-sect the Mahīśāsakas. In the *Kathāvatthu*, there are

1 *Ep. Ind.*, XX, pp. 16, 18, 19, 20, 21: "atano" or "apano."
2 *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 24. 3 *Ibid.*, p. 22.

two controversies (ix, 2; xix, 6), relating to the conception of Nirvāṇa as prevailing among the Andhakas. The one attributed to the Pubbaseliyas is that the *Amatapada* (= *Nirvāṇa*), is "an object of thought of a person not yet free from bondage",[1] and the other attributed to the Andhakas is that "the *Nibbāna-dhātu* is *kuśala* (good)" in the sense in which mental states are spoken as *kuśala* (good) and it is a faultless state.[2] Both these statements bear the implication that the Pubbaseliyas or the Andhakas conceived of *Nirvāṇa* as a 'positive faultless state'—a conception which can hardly be accepted by the Theravādins, who speak of realizing the Nibbāna within one's own self (*paccattaṃ veditabbo viññūhi*) and not of grasping the same as some object producing pure happiness.[3]

XV. *Doctrines of the Bahuśrutīyas only*

Regarding the special doctrines of the Bahuśrutīyas, the *Kathāvatthu* is silent. Though this school belonged to the Mahāsaṅghika group, it accepted, according to Vasumitra, many views of the Sarvāstivādins. Vasumitra adds that it held that Buddha's teachings relating to *anityatā, duḥkha, śūnya, anātman* and *Nirvāṇa* (transitoriness, suffering, non-existence of objects, absence of soul, and the ultimate goal) are *lokottara* (supramundane) while his teachings on topics other than those mentioned above are *laukika*[4] (mundane).

In Pāli texts the teachings and exercises connected with *maggas* and *phalas* are usually regarded as *lokottara* and the rest *laukika*.

1 Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Points of the Controversy*, pp. 231-3.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 339.
3 See *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, p. 1 f.: Mūlapariyāyasutta.
4 Masuda, pp. 35-36.

This school according to Paramārtha, attempted a syncretism of Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna and attributed two meanings, probably *nītārtha*[1] (profound) and *neyārtha*[2] (superficial) to the teachings of Buddha. It adopted the *Satyasiddhiśāstra* of Harivarman as their main text. In the Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa inscription, this school is mentioned.

XVI. *Doctrines of the Prajñaptivādins only*

Regarding the special doctrines of the *Prajñāptivādins*[1] Vasumitra remarks that they agreed mainly with the Mahāsaṅghikas (i.e. later Mahāsaṅghikas). They held in addition the following opinions:

(i) *Skandhas* and *duḥkha* are not concomitant;

(ii) The twelve *āyatanas* are not real;

(iii) Either attainment of *ārya-mārga* or death is dependent on *karma*.

The Prajñaptivādins, as Paramārtha tells us, appeared some time after the Bahuśrutīyas, and distinguished themselves as Bahuśrutīyavibhajyavādins. The main difference between the Prajñaptivādins and Bahusrutīyas is that the former partly like the Mahāyānists held the view that Buddha's teachings as embodied in the Piṭaka should be distinguished as nominal

[1] Cf. *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, p. 78:

नीतार्थसूत्रान्तविशेष जानति यथोपदिष्टा सुगतेन शून्यता ।
यस्मिन् पुनः पुद्गलसत्त्वपुरुषो नेयार्थतो जानति सर्वधर्मान् ॥

[2] Cf. *M. Vṛ.*, p. 43: उक्तं चार्याक्षयमतिसूत्रे । कतमे सूत्रान्ता नेयार्थाः कतमे नीतार्थाः । ये सूत्रान्ता मार्गावताराय निर्दिष्टा इम उच्यन्ते नेयार्थाः । ये सूत्रान्ताः फलावताराय निर्दिष्टा इम उच्यन्ते नीतार्थाः । यावद्ये सूत्रान्ताः शून्यतानिमित्ताप्रणिहितानभिसंस्काराजातानुत्पादाभावनिरात्मनिःसत्त्वनिर्जीवनिःपुद्गलास्वामिकविमोक्षमुखा निर्दिष्टाः' त उच्यन्ते नीतार्थाः । See Prof. Vidhusekhar Sastri's *Sandhābhāṣā* in *IHQ.*, IV, p. 295.

[3] This school came into existence 200 years after the Mahāsaṅghikas (*Kośa*, v, p. 24).

(*prajñapti*), real (*paramārtha*), conventional (*saṃvṛti*) and causal (*hetuphala*). This school, as against the Bahuśrutīyas, agreed more with the views of the Mahāsaṅghīkas than with those of the Sarvāstivādins.[1]

XVII. *Doctrines of the Rājagirikas and the Siddhatthikas*

In the *Kathāvatthu*, but not in Vasumitra's treatise certain special doctrines have been attributed to the Rājagirikas, and Siddhatthikas. To the former are attributed the following:

(i) *Natthi keci dhammā kehici dhammehi saṃgahitā* or *saṃpayuttā* (VII. 1 & 2)

There is no such thing as a quality attached to or adhering in another e.g. oil in mustard seeds, feeling in perception, and so forth.[2]

(ii) *Natthi cetasiko dhammo* (VII. 3)

This is a corollary to the previous opinion. It says that *citta* (mind) functions and there are no mental states associated with it.

(iii) *Cetasiko dhammo dānan ti* (VII. 4)

(iv) *Ito dinnena tattha yāpenti* (VII. 6)

By the former it means that gift is not material; the mind for making a gift is really giving. By the latter it holds that merits are accumulated, and that a person enjoys its fruits in after-life on account of such accumulation.

(v) *Paribhogamayaṃ puññaṃ vaddhati* (VII. 5)

The accumulating merits can go on increasing (by renewal of gifts of robes and other articles to monks, and so forth).

(vi) *Natthi arahato akālamaccu* (XVII. 2)

Arhats cannot die untimely, i.e. their death is also subject to the influence of *karma*.[3]

1 See Demiéville, *op. cit.*, p. 49-50.

2 Cf. The topics of the *Dhātu-kathā*, (P.T.S.).

3 Based on the statement: *kammunā vattati loko*.

(vii) *Sabbaṃ idaṃ kammato* (XVII. 3)

Everything is subject to deeds.

(viii) *Kappaṭṭho kappaṃ tiṭṭheyā* (XIII. 1)

A being destined to live for an aeon lives for an aeon, as one consigned to purgatory for committing Saṅghabheda.

XVIII. *Doctrines of the Vetulyakas only*

In the *Kathāvatthu*, the following doctrines are specially attributed to the Vetulyakas:

"(i) *Na vattabbaṃ 'Buddho Bhagavā manussaloke aṭṭhāsi'*
This point has been discussed above (p. 75).

(ii) *Na vattabbaṃ Buddhassa dinnaṃ mahapphalaṃ hoti* (XVII. 10).

As Buddha as a person does not exist, it is meaningless to say that gifts to Buddha produce great merit.

(iii) *Na vattabbaṃ "saṃgho dakkhiṇaṃ paṭiganhāti"*

(iv) *Na vattabbaṃ "saṃgho dakkhiṇaṃ visodheti"*

(v) *Na vattabbaṃ "saṃgho bhuñjati pivati khādati sāyati"*

(vi) *Na vattabbaṃ "saṃghassa dinnaṃ mahapphalaṃ hoti"* (XVII. 6-9).

All the four opinions are of the same import. The question raised here whether Saṅgha is a body of individuals who have attained *magga* and *phala* (fruits of sanctification) or Saṅgha is identical with *maggaphala*. This school holds that Saṅgha does not exist apart from *maggaphala* and so it is not proper to say that Saṅgha receives gifts, or purifies it, or enjoys it, or a gift made to a Saṅgha is productive of great merits.[1]

1 Cf. *Milindapañha*, p. 95 f.; *Kośa*, iv. 32; also see L. de La Vallée Poussin's paper on *La doctrine des refuges* in the *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, vol. I, p. 64 f.

CHAPTER IX

DOCTRINES OF GROUP III SCHOOLS

The Mahīśāsakas, Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, and other Schools

The third group of schools, according to the Pāli tradition, comprised the Mahiṃsāsakas and their offshoots, viz., Dhammaguttikas, Sabbatthivādins, Kassapikas, Saṅkantikas, and Suttavādī. According to this tradition the Mahiṃsāsakas were the earliest to secede from the Theravāda among its sub-sects. Out of the Mahiṃsāsakas, developed the Sabbatthivādins and gradually the other schools.

Vasumitra puts the appearance of sub-sects of this group a little differently. According to him Sarvāstivāda first branched off from the Sthaviravāda, and from the former appeared the Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīya and Saṃkrāntivādins one after another at the intervals of a century. Out of the Mahīśāsakas developed only the Dharmaguptakas.

Comparing the two traditions, it will be observed that the two lists agree excepting the first appearance of the Mahiṃsāsaka as stated in the Pāli texts. This anomaly can be easily explained thus: A reference to the doctrines of this school reveals that there were two Mahīśāsaka schools, one earlier and the other later. Vasumitra missed the earlier Mahīśāsakas while enumerating the sub-sects.[1] He, however, points out that the earlier Mahīśāsakas agreed more with the Theravādins while the later with the Sarvāstivādins. It may be that the Pāli tradition was aware of

1 See *infra*, p. 117.

the earlier division only of the Mahīśāsakas, and so naturally placed their origin before the Sarvāstivādins.

THE EARLIER MAHĪŚĀSAKAS

The antiquity of the Mahīśāsakas goes back to the time of the first Buddhist Council, hence its origin is anterior to that of the Mahāsaṅghikas. The Vinaya texts of the Theravādins (in Pāli), of the Mahīśāsakas and of the Dharmaguptakas record the differences of opinion—relating to seven rules according to the Mahīśāsakas, and eight rules according to the Dharmaguptakas—between Mahākassapa and Purāṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri (near Rājagṛha). The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya attached special importance to the person of Purāṇa, his insistence on a second rehearsal which, according to this school, was complied with by Mahākassapa, as also the incorporation in the Vinaya of the seven rules relating to food.[1] This shows clearly that Purāṇa and his admirers and followers formed a group by themselves, though probably not yet known by the designation, Mahīśāsaka. Prof. Przyluski has discussed this in his work *Le Concile de Rājagṛha* (pp. 319 ff.) on the basis of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmagupta Vinaya texts in Chinese.

He writes that the episode of Purāṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri[2] in the account of the first council marks the difference between the Theravādins and the Mahīśāsakas. In course of time, that group of monks who held Purāṇa in high esteem formed the Mahīśāsaka school by including his seven rules not accepted by Mahākassapa in his Vinaya code. In the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, the

1 See *Indian Antiquary*, 1908, pp. 5-6.

2 "Purāṇa demeure dans le sud." Here by "sud," he means Dakkhiṇāgiri, which is not really in the south.

second place of seniority is awarded to Purāṇa, the first being given to Kauṇḍinya. The Mahīśāsakas assert that after the deliberations of the first council were finished, the texts were once more recited for the approval of Purāṇa, who accepted the same after adding his seven rules.

Regarding the geographical expansion of the school, Prof. Przyluski points out that (i) Purāṇa refers to the people of Mahīsaka; (ii) that the alternative name of this school is Mahāvantaka;[1] and (iii) that the Vinaya text of this school was found by Fa-hien in Ceylon.

On the basis of these facts he states that the line of expansion of this school was the same as that of the Theravāda, i.e. along the Kauśāmbi-Bharukaccha axis and that it gradually extended up to the sea-borne countries, and that it became particularly popular in Mahiṣamaṇḍala and Avantī, and ultimately reached Ceylon.

Prof. Przyluski's suggestions are supported by the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions, in which it is stated that the queen of Vanavāsī erected a pillar and a monastery at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa for the benefit of the ācāryas of the Mahīśāsaka sect. Vanavāsī corresponds to North Kanara. There is also a village called Vanavāsī in the Shimoga District of the Mysore State and lies on the border of Mysore territory and North Kanara.[2] Vanavāsī is also one of the countries which was visited by the mission of Aśoka's reign, and it was from this country that a *mahāthera* called Caṇḍagutta went to Ceylon at the invitation of Duṭṭha-

1 Tāranātha in his *Geschichte* (pp. 175, 273) speaks of the Avantakas as an offshoot of the Sāṃmitīyas.

2 *EI.*, XX, p. 36; cf. *EI.*, vol. III, p. 117; *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, V. 23; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XII, 31; XXIX, 42; B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 66.

gāmaṇi to take part in the celebrations for erecting the *mahā-thupa*. Hence, it may be concluded that the Mahīśāsakas became popular in Vanavāsī, i.e. in North Kanara and Mysore, and probably had some followers in Ceylon, as their school agreed with the Theravādins in fundamental doctrines and disciplinary rules. In short, this school had its sphere of influence in south-western India and Ceylon.[1]

The *Kathāvatthu* has not a word to say about the doctrines of this school. This silence, though a negative evidence, confirms our supposition that the Theravādins had little or no difference with the Mahīśāsakas as far as their doctrines were concerned. Vasumitra furnishes us with the following information regarding the doctrines of this school.

Doctrines of the earlier Mahīśāsakas

The Mahīśāsakas rejected the "Sabbam atthi" thesis of the Sarvāstivādins[2] and held that the present only exists. They made it more emphatic by stating that all *saṃskāras* perish at every moment and that entrance into the womb is the beginning, and death is the end, of human life. The material constituents of the sense-organs as also *citta* and *caitasikas* are subject to change. In other words, there are no real elements.

They do not enter into the question of Buddha's attributes and probably like the Theravādins held Buddha as an average human being.

Regarding *Arhats*, they state (i) a srotaāpanna has a chance of retrogression while an arhat has not and that (ii) arhats do not perform meritorious deeds. Both of these opinions are

1 Cf. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, pp. 325, 327—Mahiṣamaṇḍala, Avanti and other sea-borne countries on the west.

2 For Sarvāstivāda views, see *infra*.

directly opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins and are partly in agreement with those of the Theravādins.

Re. *Samyakatvanyāma*, the Mahīśāsakas have nothing to say. They state against the opinion of the Sarvāstivādins that there is no *deva* who leads a holy life.

Re. *Anupubbābhisamaya*, the Mahīśāsakas held views contrary to those of the Sarvāstivādins. They state that the four truths are to be meditated upon at one and the same time. As against the opinion of the Theravādins, they held that transition from one jhāna to another is immediate (*Kvu.*, XVIII. 6).

Re. *Puthujjana, etc.*, the Mahīśāsakas held the following views in agreement with the Sarvāstivādins excepting the last:

(i) An average man is able to destroy *rāga* and *pratigha* in the Kāmadhātu.

(ii) There is *laukikasamyagdṛṣṭi* (right view relating to worldly matter).

(iii) There is no *laukikaśraddhendriya* (faculty of faith obtained by a worldly man). This is discussed in the *Kvu.*, XIX. 8 (see above, p. 97).

Re. *Anuśaya and Paryavasthāna*, the opinions of the Mahīśāsakas are directly opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins and are in agreement with those of the Mahāsaṅghikas: —

(i) *Anuśaya* (dormant passion) is neither *citta* (mind) nor *caitasika* (mental).

(ii) *Anuśaya* is different from pervading passion (*paryavasthāna*).

(iii) *Anuśaya* is never an object of thought (*anālambana*).

(iv) *Anuśaya* is dissociated from mind (*citta-viprayukta*).

(v) *Paryavasthāna* is associated with mind (*citta-samprayukta*).

All these have been discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* in connection with the doctrines of the schools of Group II (see above, pp. 65, 93 f.).

Re. *Meditation & Smṛtyupasthāna,* the only difference between the Mahīśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins is that the former do not recognise any *lokottaradhyāna.* They agree with the Sarvāstivādins in holding that all *dharmas* (mārgāṅgas) are included in the four *smṛtyupasthānas* (introspectional practices).

Re. *Vijñāna,* the Sarvāstivādins state that the five *vijñānas* (perception derived by the organs of sense) engender *rāga* (attachment) but not *virāga* (detachment). The Mahīśāsakas consider this unreasonable and hold that these conduce both to *sarāga* and *virāga.* Both the schools agree in holding that the six *vijñānas* combine with *vitarka* and *vicāra* (see above, p. 66-67).

Re. *Asaṃskṛta & Antarābhava,* the views of the Mahīśāsakas are all opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins: —

(i) There are nine unconstituted (*asaṃskṛta*) *dharmas,* but this list is different from that of the Mahāsaṅghikas.

(ii) There is no intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*).

(iii) There is nothing which can transmigrate from one world to another.

There are a few other opinions which are also contrary to those of the Sarvāstivādins, viz.,

(i) No heretic can gain the five supernatural powers.

(ii) Good *karma* cannot become the cause of existence.

In addition to the above the Mahīśāsakas held the following two views: —

(i) Though Buddha is included in the Saṅgha, a gift made to Buddha is more meritorious than that to the Saṅgha.

(ii) *Buddhayāna* and *Śrāvakayāna* have the same emancipation (*vimukti*).

THE LATER MAHĪŚĀSAKAS

We have already pointed out that there were two schools of Mahīśāsakas, one earlier and the other later. The views stated above were held by the earlier. The later Mahīśāsakas accepted the cardinal doctrine of the Sarvāstivādins that past and future exist, and asserted that *skandhas, dhātus* and *āyatanas* in their subtlest form are always present, so also are the *anuśayas*. They added that the earth lasts for aeons. They agree with the Sarvāstivādins in holding that there is *antarābhava*. The later Mahīśāsakas, therefore, were as much in agreement with the Sarvāstivādins as the earlier Mahīśāsakas were with the Theravādins.

THE SARVĀSTIVĀDA

At the outset, it should be pointed out that the wide popularity of the Sarvāstivāda has put into shade all other schools, and that, particularly, for its propagation all over Northern India and in countries outside India, like Central Asia and China. Its origin should be placed some time after the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsaṅghikas. There is no doubt that it branched off from the Mahīśāsakas and not from the Theravādins directly as stated by Vasumitra and other writers of later days. These Sarvāstivādins should be distinguished from the Mūlasarvāstivādins,[1] who probably modified certain doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, as also from the Vaibhāṣikas, in which name this school was latterly known from the time of Kaṇiṣka.[2]

1 I-tsing speaks of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. See Takakusu, pp. xxiii-iv, 7-14, 20.

2 In Kashmir there were both Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas (ye vinayavidādayaḥ Sautrāntikā bhadantādayaḥ). The latter are described

Vasubandhu, in his *Abhidharmakośa*, has the Kashmir Vaibhāṣikas more in view than the early Sarvāstivādins. This is due to the fact that the Vaibhāṣikas became more popular since the days of Kaniṣka and became predominant in Kashmir and Gandhāra.[1] The popularity of the early Sarvāstivādins was confined to Northern India around Mathurā, where it had its origin.

Prof. Przyluski[2] rightly traces the origin of the Sarvāstivāda school in the grouping of monks, shown in the account of the Second Council. He says that the monks collected by Yasa hailed mainly from two centres, of which one was Kausambi-Avanti and the other Mathurā. The former developed into the Theravāda and Mahīśāsaka schools while the latter into Sarvāstivāda, and both were opposed to the Mahāsaṅghikas whose centre was at Pāṭaliputra and Vesāli.

Succession of Teachers

If we turn to the succession of teachers (*ācariyaparamparā*) as given in almost all Sanskrit traditions, preserved in Tibetan, it will be observed that after Sambhūta Śāṇavāsi, the succession is recorded differently from that in Pāli. Buston and Tāranātha,[3]

in the *Kośa-Vyākhyā* (VIII. 32) as Vinaya-vid. There were also Vaibhāṣikas who lived outside Kashmir referred to in the *Kośa* as "bahirdeśakā Vaibhāṣikā."

1. Prof. Takakusu writes (*JPTS.*, 1904-5, p. 119) that the Sarvāstivādins were also distinguished in the *Vibhāṣā* as Kashmirian and Gandharian, but after compilation of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* the former eclipsed the latter and became known as Kāśmira-Vaibhāṣikas, or simply Vaibhāṣikas.

2. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

3. See Buston, II, p. 108. He derived his information from the *Vinayakṣudraka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

tell us that Mahākassapa entrusted the guardianship of the Saṅgha to Ānanda, who in turn entrusted the same to Sambhūta Śāṇavāsi. The latter gave over the guardianship to Upagupta of Mathurā.[1] It is well-known that in the Sanskrit Avadānas, Upagupta is made the spiritual adviser of Aśoka as against Moggaliputta Tissa of the Pāli texts. This also lends support to the view that Mathurā became the first seat of the Sarvāstivādins soon after the Second Council, and that it was from Mathurā that the influence of the Sarvāstivādins radiated all over Northern India, particularly over Gandhāra and Kashmir.

The propagation of Buddhism in Gandhāra and Kashmir has an independent history of its own. Both the Pāli and Sanskrit traditions state that Madhyāntika (Majjhantika) was responsible for the propagation of the religion in these two countries. Madhyāntika was a disciple of Ānanda and so he was a contemporary of Sambhūta Śāṇavāsi and senior to Upagupta. Madhyāntika is recognised as a teacher by the Sarvāstivādins. That Madhyāntika preached there Sarvāstivāda Buddhism in Kashmir is corroborated by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang who tells us that Aśoka not only sent Buddhist monks to Kashmir but also built monasteries at that place.[2] He writes that during Aśoka's reign there was in Magadha "a subtle investigator of *name and reality*, and who put his extraordinary thoughts in a treatise which taught heresy.' An attempt was made to drown into the Ganges these monks who however saved themselves by flying through the air to Kashmir where they settled on the hills and the valleys. On hearing this, Aśoka felt remorse and requested them to return, and on their refusal, built for them 500

1 Upagupta was followed by Dhitika.
2 Watters, I, p. 269.

monasteries and "gave up all Kashmir for the benefit of the Buddhist church."[1] The fact underlying this story is that the "investigators of *name and reality*" were none other than the Sarvāstivādins, whose principal tenet is that *nāma* and *rūpa* are real and are divisible into 64 elements which exist for ever (*sarvam asti*), and it is for this they had the appellation of Sarvāstivāda.[2] Then the statement that they resorted to the hills and valleys of Kashmir corroborates the flight of the Sarvāstivādin monks to the north in Kashmir.

Yuan Chwang must have fallen into confusion in regard to the name Mahādeva. There were very probably two persons of this name "one an influential abbot of Pāṭaliputra"[3] who preached the *Devadūta-sūtra*,[4] and the other a monk who introduced the tenets relating to the imperfections of an Arhat.[5] Mahādeva the investigator of *name and reality* must have been a Sarvāstivādin while the other Mahādeva, who attributed imperfections to an Arhat, was a Mahāsaṅghika. Yuan Chwang further confused the Theravādins with the Mahāsaṅghikas when he wrote that Aśoka supported the Mahāsaṅghikas against the Theravādins, and that 500 Arhats left Pāṭaliputra and propagated the Sthavira School in Kashmir, while the majority of the inferior brethren at Pāṭaliputra began the Mahāsaṅghika school.[6] The Mahāsaṅghikas, as we know, lived originally at Vesali and later on passed on to the south, making their principal centre in the Andhra country at Dhanakataka (present Guntur District).

The statement that Aśoka became later on repentant and wanted the monks who fled to Kashmir to return to Magadha

1 Watters, I, p. 267.
2 See *Infra*.
3 Watters, I, p. 269.
4 *Majjhima*, III, 179.
5 Watters, I, p. 268. See above, pp. 64, 84-8.
6 Watters, I, p. 269.

may be an indirect reference to the fact recorded in the *Divyāvadāna*[1] and *Aśokāvadāna*[2] that Aśoka made an attempt towards the end of his life to reconcile the monks of the different schools of Buddhist thought by convening a council to which he particularly invited the monks living at Tamasāvana in Kashmir. The Ceylonese chronicles maintain a discreet silence over this incident, and this is not unusual in view of the sectarian spirit permeating the chronicles.

The Sarvāstivādins also claim Aśoka as their patron. They ignore the name of Moggaliputta Tissa and put in its stead the name of Upagupta as the spiritual adviser of Aśoka. The Avadāna literature of the Sarvāstivādins is full of episodes dealing with the life and munificence of Aśoka. Tāranātha also speaks of his lavish gifts to the Sarvāstivāda monks of Aparantaka, Kashmir and Tukhāra.[3] Kalhaṇa[4] writes that Aśoka not only built Śrīnagarī but also covered Suskaletra and Vitastrā with numerous stūpas, one of which was so high that its pinnacle could not be seen. Yuan Chwang noticed four Aśoka topes, each of which contained relics of Buddha's body. The Avadānas record that Aśoka's liberality to the Buddhist monks was carried to such an excess towards the end of his life that his grandson Sampadi[5] who was in charge of his treasury refused to carry out

1 *Divyā.*, p. 399 वसन्ति काश्मीरपुरे सुरम्ये ये चापि धीरास्तमसावनेऽस्मिन् ; *IA.*, 1895, pp. 241 ff.

2 Prof. Przyluski writes in his *Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka*, pp. 101, 117 that a council of 30,000 monks was held by Aśoka, his sources of information being the *Aśokāvadāna* and Tāranātha (Schiefner, p. 38) but we do not find any such reference in Tāranātha.

3 Schiefner, p. 38.

4 Stein, I, p. 19.

5 *Divyā.*, p. 430. Tib. ནོར་ལྷས་བྱིན། It has been restored by Schiefner as Vāsavadatta, but it may also be Dhanadā or Sampadi.

his commands and even reduced his food to a myrobalan, half of which was the last gift made by him to the Buddhist Saṅgha.

Through the activities of the Sarvāstivādins, Kashmir became a centre of Buddhist philosophical studies[1] and was, according to Tāranātha, also the scene of the activities of Vatsa, the propounder of the Ātmaka theory (*pudgalavāda*) and the founder of the Vātsiputrīya or Sammitīya school.[2]

Geographical Expansion

At the time of Aśoka, therefore, we may hold that there were two centres of the Sarvāstivādins, one at Mathurā with Upagupta as the head of the Saṅgha and the other in Kashmir with Madhyāntika as its founder It may be that the latter centre became in course of time the seat of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Vaibhāṣikas. On account of the popularity of this school in the north, there is no reference to it in the early inscriptions of Central India. Among the donees mentioned in the Barhut and Sañcī inscriptions, the name of this sect does not appear.[3] Its name appears in the inscriptions of later dates, like Kamasi inscription,[4] Set Mahet Image inscription[5] of the time of Kaniṣka or Huviṣka and inscriptions on the Mathurā Lion Capital.[6] In the Sarnāth inscription it is incidentally stated that the Sarvāstivādins ousted the Theravādins there and they in turn were overrun by the Sammitīyas in 300 A.D.[7] There is no reference to the Sarvāstivādins in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and the Amarāvati inscriptions.

Very likely its progressive career had a set-back for some time during the reign of Puṣyamitra as is evidenced by

1 See *Gilgit Ms.*, vol. I, Intro.
2 Schiefner, p. 44. See *Infra*.
3 See *JRAS.*, 1892, p. 597.
4 *EI.*, II, p. 212.
5 *EI.*, VIII, p. 111; IX, p. 29.
6 *EI.*, IX, p. 135.
7 See *Infra*.

the *Divyāvadāna* a text of this school but the several donations made during this period by the devotees prove that it was professed by a large section of the people. Its revival came with the invasions of the Græco-Bactrians, Śakas, Pahlavas, Parthians and Yavanas. The *Milindapañha,* the original of which was in Sanskrit, very likely belonged to this school.[1] The existence of this text shows that the Græco-Bactrian kings like Menander were interested in this religion. Its complete revival took place during the reign of the Śakas, and the popularity of this sect reached its climax in the reign of Kaniṣka.

Fahien (319-414 A.D.) noticed the existence of this school at Pāṭaliputra while Yuan Chwang (629-645 A.D.) found it "chiefly in Kashgar, Udyana, and several other places in the Northern Frontier, in Matipur, Kanauj, and a place near Rājagṛha and also in Persia."[2] I-tsing came across the adherents of this school in Lāṭa, Sindhu, Southern and Eastern India, Sumatra, Java, China, Central Asia and Cochin China.[3] From the above evidences it is apparent how widely popular was this school all over Northern India and outside India, but little known in Southern and Western India.

Buston's information about the School

According to Buston, the founder of this school was Rāhulabhadra of the Kṣatriya caste "renowned for his devotion to discipline." The mantle worn by the members of this school had 25 to 29 fringes, and their badge had an *utpala* (a lotus), a jewel, and the leaf of a tree.[4]

1 *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā*, ix, 12 (Jap. ed.), p. 708 refers to Nāgasena as *pūrvaka-sthavira.*

2 *JPTS.*, (Prof. Takakusu), 1904-5, p. 71; Legge's *Fahien*, p. 99; *JRAS.*, 1891, p. 420; Takakusu's *I-tsing*, pp. xxii-xxiv.

3 I-tsing, Intro.

4 Buston, II, p. 100.

He further writes "Just as the high classes establish the mundane laws and customs of a country or race, in a similar manner the Sarvāstivādins as they spoke in Sanskrit, the language of the higher classes, represent the foundation of the other sect."[1]

It cannot be definitely stated whether Buston had the Sarvāstivādins or the Mūla-Sarvāstivādins in mind.[2]

Language and Literature

The Tibetan traditions corroborated by the recent finds of manuscripts in Eastern Turkestan leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Sarvāstivādins adopted grammatical Sanskrit (and not mixed Sanskrit) as the medium of their literature and that they possessed a complete canon of their own in three divisions *Sūtra, Vinaya* and *Abhidharma*. The sub-divisions of these three piṭakas were also substantially the same as those in Pāli.

Our main source of information regarding the literature of this school is the Chinese and occasionally Tibetan versions of the Tripiṭaka, supplemented by the find of manuscripts in Central Asia, Eastern Turkestan, Gilgit and Nepal, and by quotations found in works like the *Lalitavistara, Mahāvastu, Madhyamaka-vṛtti, Sūtrālaṅkāra* of Asaṅga, *Divyāvadāna, Abhidharmakośa* with its *Bhāṣya* and *Vyākhyā*. It may be questioned whether the informations available about the literature of this school are of the Sarvāstivādins or of the Mūla-Sarvāstivādins. For the present it is not possible to distinguish between the two,

1 Buston, II, pp. 99-100.

2 Hiuen Tsang states that the Sarvāstivādins had a peculiar mode of wearing and colouring their robes not approved by the followers of several schools (Watters, I, pp. 150 ff. Takakusu, *I-tsing*).

but it seems that the Āgamas were common to both, so also were the Abhidharma texts. It is only in regard to Vinaya and a few Avadāna texts there might have some differences.

SŪTRAS: The Sūtra-Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins was divided into Āgamas corresponding to *Nikāyas* of the Pāli school. There were four Āgamas called *Dīrgha, Madhyama, Saṃyukta* and *Ekottara*. In the *Kośa* there are references to the *Kṣudraka* implying thereby the existence of a *Kṣudrakāgama* too. Prof. Akanuma has compared the Āgamas in Chinese with the Pāli Nikāyas[1] in detail and has come to the following conclusions: The *Dīrghāgama* contains 30 Sūtras as against 34 of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. Of the 13 suttas in the first volume of the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya, 3 only are omitted in the *Dīrghāgama* viz., *Mahāli* (no. 6), *Jāliya* (no. 7) and *Subha* (no. 10). All the suttas of the other two volumes are contained in this Āgama with a few in the Madhyamāgama. The order of arrangement of the sūtras in the Āgamas and Nikāyas differs widely, e.g., *Mahāpadāna* is the first sutta in the Āgama in place of *Brahmajāla* of the Nikāya. In the Āgama the order of sūtras is as follows: *Mahāpadāna, Mahāparinibbāna, Mahāgovinda, Janavasabha, Aggañña, Cakkavatti, Sīhanāda, Pāyāsi, Udumbarika-Sīhanāda, Saṅgīti, Dasuttara, Mahānidāna, Sakka-pañha, Pāṭika, Siṅgālovāda, Pāsādika, Sampasādanīya, Mahāsamaya, Ambaṭṭha, Brahmajāla, Sonadaṇḍa, Kūṭadanta, Kevaṭṭa, Kassapa-sīhanāda, Tevijja, Sāmaññaphala, Poṭṭhapāda, Lohicca*. The Āgama contains two other suttas.

Of these suttas, fragments of the *Āṭānāṭīya* and *Saṅgīti* have been discovered in Eastern Turkestan[2] and quotations from the *Brahmajāla* and *Saṅgīti* appear in the *Abhidharmakośa*.

1 *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, Japan, (1929).

2 Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan.*

The relation of the sūtras of the *Madhyamāgama* to those of the *Majjhima Nikāya* is similar to the *Dīgha*. Of the 152 suttas in the three volumes of the *Majjhima*, only 19 suttas are omitted in the Āgama, *viz.*, *Cūḷasāropama* (no. 30), *Mahāsaccaka* (no. 36), *Sāleyyaka* (no. 41), *Verañjaka* (no. 42), *Kandaraka* (no. 51), *Jīvaka* (no. 55), *Kukkuravatika* (no. 57), *Abhayarājakumāra* (no. 58), *Apaṇṇaka* (no. 60), *Tevijja-Vacchagotta* (no. 71), *Ghoṭamukha* (no. 94), *Cankī* (no. 95), *Vāseṭṭha* (no. 98), *Saṅgārava* (no. 100), *Pañcattaya* (no. 102), *Kinti* (no. 103), *Sunakkhatta* (no. 105), *Anupada* (no. 111) and *Bhaddekaratta* (no. 131). In the *Madhyamāgama*, there are in all 222 sūtras, 82 of which correspond to the suttas in the *Aṅguttara*, 10 to suttas in the *Saṃyutta*, 9 to those in the *Dīgha* and rest to suttas in the *Majjhima*. There are a few of these suttas in Pāli not found in the Āgama., while a few stray suttas correspond to passages in the *Suttanipāta*, *Thera-theri-gāthā* and *Vinaya* (*Mahāvagga*). In view of the mixture of the suttas from two or three Nikāyas in this Āgama we can hardly expect much agreement in the order of the arrangement of the sūtras.

Fragments of two sūtras of the *Madhyamāgama*, viz., *Upāli* and *Śuka*, have been discovered in Eastern Turkestan.[1]

The agreement between the *Saṃyukta-Āgama* and *Saṃyutta Nikāya* is similar to that of the *Madhyamāgama* and *Majjhima Nikāya*. The *Sagāthavagga* (Sec. I) of the two piṭakas has much in common but not the *Nidānavagga* (Sec. II); the 8th and 9th chapters of *Nidāna*, viz., *Samaṇa-brāhmaṇa* and *Antarapeyyāla* are wanting in the Āgama, while the 1st and 5th chapters (*Buddha* and *Gahapati*) show marked differences. In the same section, *Abhisamaya*, *Dhātu* and other *saṃyuttas* are almost

1 Hoernle, *op. cit.*

passed over in the Āgama, but there is much commonness in the following five Saṃyuttas: *Anamatagga, Kassapa, Lakkhaṇa, Opamma* and *Bhikkhu*. In the *Khandha-vagga* (Section III) of the Āgama, the following *saṃyuttas* are wanting: *Okkantika, Uppāda, Kilesa, Sāriputta, Nāga, Gandhabbakāya, Valāha, Vacchagotta* and *Jhāna*. In the *Saḷāyatana-vagga* (Section IV), the following are absent: *Mātugāma, Moggallāna, Asaṅkhata, Sammappadhāna, Bāla* and *Iddhipāda*, while major portions of the *Magga, Indriya* and *Sacca* omitted.

The *Saṃyuktāgama*, as it exists in Chinese, is divided into 50 sections and incorporates a large number of suttas of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and a few of the other texts. There are also a few sūtras which have no parallels in Pāli.

A fragment of the *Śroṇasūtra* of this Āgama has been discovered in Eastern Turkestan while Prof. Sylvain Lèvi traced a few quotations from this Āgama in the *Sūtrālaṃkāra* of Asaṅga,[1] and identified the following fragments from the collection of Grünwedel: *Kokanada-sūtra* (=*Aṅguttara*, V, pp. 196-198); *Anāthapiṇḍada-sūtra* (=*Aṅguttara*, V, pp. 185-189); *Dīrghanakha sūtra* (=*Majjhima*, I, pp. 497-501); *Śarabha-sūtra* (=*Aṅguttara*, I, pp. 185-188); *Pravrājaka Sthavirasūtra* and *Brāhmaṇasatyāni sūtra* (=*Aṅguttara*, II, p. 185) — all included in the Chinese translation of the *Saṃyuktāgama*.[2]

The *Ekottarāgama* and the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* have very little in common. This is partly due to the fact that a large number of the suttas of the *Aṅguttara* is included in the *Madhyama* and *Saṃyukta Āgamas*. The Pāli text is much more extensive than the Sanskrit and it seems that the growth of this part of the Piṭaka took place independently of each other. From Akanuma's comparative studies, the following may be pointed

1 See Winternitz, p. 234 fn. 2 *Toung Pao*, V, p. 299.

out as being more or less common in the two piṭakas: *Samacitta* (I, pp. 61-9), *Devadūta* (I, pp. 132-150), *Brāhmaṇa* to *Loṇaphala* (I, pp. 155-258), *Cakka* (II, pp. 32-44), *Muṇḍarāja* (III, pp. 45-62), *Nīvaraṇa* (III, pp. 63-79), *Āghāta* (III, pp. 185-202), *Devatā* to *Mahā* (III, pp. 329-420), *Avyākata* to *Mahā* (IV, pp. 67-139), *Gahapati* (IV, pp. 208-235), *Savitta* (V, pp. 92-112), *Upāsaka* (V, pp. 176-210), *Jānussoṇi* (V, pp. 249-273), and *Anussati* (V, pp. 328-358). This is not an exhaustive list, for there are stray agreements in other sections.

A fifth Āgama was not recognised by the schools other than the Theravāda. In the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 17, 331, 333) and elsewhere the Āgamas are referred to as *Āgamacatustayaṃ*. In the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions also, four Nikāyas are spoken of and not five. The Pāli *Khuddaka Nikāya* is really a collection not of discourses, short or long, but of a number of independent works which could not be included in one of the four Nikāyas. By *Khuddaka,* the Pālists probably meant "other works" or "miscellaneous works." Though the Sarvāstivādins did not have a fifth Nikāya, they had a few texts like the *Udānavarga, Suttanipāta* (*Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyaṇa vaggas*), *Sthavira-gāthā, Dharmapada, Vimānavastu,* and *Buddhavaṃsa,* which came later on to be collectively called *Kṣudrākāgama* (see above, p. 125).

VINAYA: Our information about the Vinaya texts of the Sarvāstivādins is derived solely from the catalogues of Chinese canonical literature. In Nanjio's *Catalogue*, we came across the following titles:—

(i) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-mātṛkā,* translated by Saṅghavarman (445 A.D.): Taisho, xxiii, 1441; Nanjio 1132.

(ii) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā,* translator unknown (350-431 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1440; Nanjio 1135, 1136.

(iii) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-saṅgraha*, compiled by the venerable Jinamitra, translated by I-tsing (700 A.D.); Nanjio 1127.

(iv) *Daśādhyāya-vinaya-nidāna*, translated by Vimalākṣa (being the preface to the *Daśādhyāya-vinaya*), Nanjio 1144.

(v) *Daśādhyāya-vinaya-bhikṣu-prātimokṣa*, translated by Kumārajīva (404 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1436; Nanjio 1160.

(vi) *Daśādhyāya-vinaya-bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa*, compiled by Fa-yin (420-479 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1437; Nanjio 1161.

(vii) *Daśādhyāya-vinaya* or the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, translated by Puṇyatara together with Kumārajīva (404 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1435; Nanjio 1115.

The principal text of the Sarvāstivādins was the *Daśādhyāya-vinaya*. Fa-hien writes that he came across a Sarvāstivāda-vinaya in verses, but the Chinese translation of the *Daśādhyāya-vinaya* attributed to the Sarvāstivādins is in prose. The *Daśādhyāya* (Taisho ed., xxiii, 1435) is divided into 14 sections. It opens with the eight sections of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra. The ninth section deals with "seven dharmas" viz., *śikṣāpada, poṣadha, pāpadeśanā, varṣāvāsa, carmavastu, bhaiṣajyavastu* and *cīvara* (precepts, fortnightly ceremonies, confession, dwelling in the rainy season, use of leather-shoes, use of medicines, and robes of monks). The tenth section contains "eight dharmas", viz., *Kaṭhina, Kauśāmbī, Campā, Pāṇḍulohitaka, Saṅghāvaśeṣaparivāsa, Paṭicchādana, Śayanāsana* and *Āsamudācārika-dharma* (rules re. making of Kaṭhina-robes, dispute at Kauśāmbī, events at Campā, deeds of Pāṇḍulohitaka-monks, atonement for Saṅghāvaśeṣa-offences, concealment of irreligious acts, rules regarding bed and seat, and rules

regarding proper conduct of monks).[1] The eleventh section entitled "saṃyutta", i.e. miscellaneous rules, deals with the *dhūta* and other extra-ordinary precepts observed by monks. The twelfth section is devoted to *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* containing, as it does, 8 *Pārājikā*, 17 *Saṅghāvaśeṣā*, 30 *Naiḥsargikā*, 78 *Pāyantikā*, 8 *Prātideśanīyā* and *Aṣṭa-dharmā*. The thirteenth section re-arranges the preceding rules in the *Ekottara* style, from one to eleven dharmas. The concluding section, the fourteenth, contains the *Upāli-paripṛcchā*, a well-known text on disciplinary rules.[2]

This text contains almost all the chapters of the vinaya of the Theravādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins,[3] and apears to be a much shotter version of the text of the latter. From the title, one expects ten chapters, but actually there are fourteen, and so we have to assume that four of the fourteen chapters were later additions or were originally treated as supplements. The 11th, 13th and 14th chapters are no doubt later additions, but it is difficult to ascertain the fourth additional chapter. A close study of the Chinese translation along with the Sanskrit text of the Mūlasarvāstivādins will reveal the actual position.

ABHIDHARMA: The Abhidharma literature of the Sarvāstivādins is fairly extensive. Apart from the well-known seven texts belonging to this school and the famous Vibhāṣā-śāstras of the Vaibhāṣikas, this school had to its credit a few other philosophi-

1 The titles of *vastus* (chapters) in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya are as follows: *Pravrajyā, Poṣadha, Pravāraṇā, Varṣā, Carma, Bhaiṣajya, Civara, Kaṭhina, Kośāmbaka, Karma, Pāṇḍulohitaka, Pudgala, Pārivāsika, Poṣadhasthāpana* and *Saṃghabheda.*

2 See *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa-sūtra*, Intro., p. 3 (*IHQ.*, VII. 2).

3 For further details, see introduction to the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, pt. ii.

cal works written by Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra, Dharmatrāta and Dharmottara. None of these valuable works are available in original Sanskrit except the *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* of Yaśomitra. The *Vyākhyā* is no doubt a mine of information and contains most of the philosophical topics discussed in the Abhidharma literature of the Sarvāstivādins. It may also be regarded as a quintessence of the seven Abhidharma texts. For a general idea of the several texts at the present moment, we shall have to depend on the valuable analysis of the Chinese translations of the texts made by Prof. Takakusu in the *J.P.T.S.*, 1904-5 and the notes left by Prof. Louis de la Vallée Poussin in his introduction to the French translation of the *Abhidharmakośa*. With the publication of the *Vyākhyā* it has become possible to comprehend the terms and nomenclatures suggested by Takakusu on the basis of the Chinese renderings and form a better idea of the contents of the texts. The seven texts claimed by the Sarvāstivādins as constituting their original Abhidharmapiṭaka are as follows[1]:—

(i) *Jñānaprasthānasūtra* of Ārya Kātyāyanī-putra with its six supplements, (*ṣaṭ pādāḥ*), viz.,
(ii) *Prakaraṇapāda* of Sthavira Vasumitra
(iii) *Vijñānakāya* of Sthavira Devaśarmā
(iv) *Dharmaskandha* of Ārya Śārīputra
(v) *Prajñaptiśāstra* of Ārya Maudgalyāyana
(vi) *Dhātukāya* of Pūrṇa and
(vii) *Saṅgīti-paryāya* of Mahākauṣṭhila.

(i) The *Jñānaprasthāna-sūtra* is attributed to Ārya Kātyāyanīputra. In the *Kośa* it is stated that the actual author of the work is Buddha but the arrangements of chapters and topics had been made by Kātyāyanīputra and so its authorship is attributed

1 *Kośa*, I, 9 & 11.

to him. It was twice translated into Chinese, by Gotama Saṃghadeva of Kashmir and Chu Fo-nien, in the 4th century A.D. and by Hiuen-tsang in the 7th century. It is divided into eight sections. The first section contains exposition of *laukikāgradharmas, jñāna, pudgala, śraddhā, ahrīkatā, rūpa* and its *lakṣaṇa, anartha* (?), and *caitasikas* (= supramundane topics,[1] knowledge, individuality, faith and reverence, lack of modesty, material constituents of the body and their characteristics, *anartha* (?) and mental states). The second section details the *saṃyojanas* or defilements which hinder the spiritual progress of an adept, and the causes of defilements. The third section is devoted to the acquisition of the knowledge (*jñāna*) (a) of doctrinal matters by which a *sekha* becomes an *asekha*, (b) of right and wrong views, (c) of the means of attaining six *abhijñās*, (d) of the four truths and of the acquisitions to be made in the four stages of sanctification. The fourth section details the evil words and acts with their consequences as also explains the *vijñaptis* and *avijñapti*[2]. The fifth section gives an exposition of *rūpaskandha*, i.e., the four great elements and of things originating out of them, both internal and external. The sixth section analyses the 22 *indriyas* (predominant faculties) and the three spheres of existence viz., *kāma, rūpa* and *arūpa*, and explains in detail the *sparśendriya, mūla-citta,* etc. The seventh section is devoted to the mental states developed by an adept while he is in *samādhi*, and gradually advances from Sakadāgāmi to Anāgāmi stage. The last, the eighth section explains the four *smṛtyupasthānas*, the various wrong views, and such other matters.

1 *Kośa* (Fr. transl.), Intro., p. xxx. See *Infra*, p. 153-4.
2 *Kośa*, I, 11.

Dr. Barua suggests that this work may be paralleled with the Pāli text *Paṭisambbhidāmagga.*[1] There may be a verbal resemblance between the two texts, but the *Jñānaprasthāna* is written more on the lines of Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* than on the *Paṭisambbhidāmagga.* The title also suggests that the work is expected to contain topics leading to the highest knowledge, which, in other words, is purity or emancipation.

The second book is entitled *Prakaraṇapāda.* Its authorship is attributed to Sthavira Vasumitra, who, according to the Chinese tradition, composed it in a monastery, at Puṣkarāvatī. It was translated into Chinese by Guṇabhadra and Bodhiyaśas of Central India (A.D. 435-443) and also by Hiuen-tsang (A.D. 659). The work is divided into eight chapters. The first defines *rūpa, citta, caitasikas, cittaviprayuktas* and *asaṃskṛtas*[2] (material constituents, mind, mental states, non-mental states, and the unconstituted). The second deals with the same topics as those discussed in the last two chapters of the third section of the *Jñānaprasthānasūtra.* The third explains the sense-organs and their spheres of action while the fourth defines several terms, such as *dhātu, āyatana, skandha, mahābhūmikas*[2] (cf. *Kośa,* II, 23, III, 32), etc. The fifth chapter analyses the *anuśayas* (dormant passions), while the sixth touches the *vijñeya, anumeya* and *anāsrava dharmas* (things to be known and inferred, and pure dharmas). The concluding chapter, the seventh, appears to be an index, containing all the technical terms with their meanings in short.

The third book, *Vijñāna-kāya* is attributed to Devaśarmā, who, according to Hiuen-tsang, compiled it at Viśoka near Śrāvastī, about a century after Buddha's death. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (649 A.D.). It is dvided into six

1 Law, *History of Pāli Lit.,* I, p. 337. 2 See *Infra,* pp. 135, 141-2.

chapters. It contains an exposition of *pudgala, indriya, citta, kleśa, vijñāna,* etc. as given by Maudgalyāyana, enumerates the different classes of beings, persons, etc., defines the function of mental states as *hetu* (cause) and *ālambana* (basis) of spiritual progress[1] and also of mental states of a perfect and an imperfect adept.[2] Prof. La Vallée Poussin remarks in his *Etudes Asiatiques* 1925 (i. 343-376) that the first two chapters contain the controversies relating to the existence of past and future, and of *pudgala* (soul).[3]

The fourth book is entitled *Dharmaskandha.* Its authorship is attributed to Śāriputra. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (659 A.D.). In the colophon of the Chinese translation this text is described as "the most important of the Abhidharma works, and the fountain-head of the Sarvāstivāda system". This book it seems appealed to the Chinese not for its subtleness and depth of philosophical discussions but for its comprehensiveness as outlining the general course of spiritual training prescribed for a Buddhist monk. This work also can be paralleled to the *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa. Its 21 sections are as follows: *Śikṣāpadas* or *Śīlas;* attainments leading to Srotaāpatti; development of faith in the Triratna; the fruits of four stages of sanctification, four *ariya-pudgalas; samyak-saṃkalpa* of the eight-fold path; attainment of *ṛddhipādas;* practice of *smṛtyupasthānas;* exposition of the *āryasatyas;* four *dhyānas;* four *apramāṇas;* four higher *samāpattis* (*ārūpyas*), practice of *bhāvanā;* exposition of *bodhyaṅgas,* and then an exposition of *indriyas, āyatanas, skandhas* and *dhātus.* Its concluding chapter explains the twelve terms of the formulæ of causation (*pratītyasamutpāda*).

1 *Kośa,* ii, 61-62.

2 *Kośa,* vii, 12.

3 Cf. *Infra,* p. 137 f.

The fifth book, *Dhātukāya*, is attributed to Pūrṇa in the Sanskrit and Tibetan tradition, and to Vasumitra by the Chinese writers. Prof. Takakusu remarks that the original Sanskrit had probably more than one recension. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (663 A.D.). The object of the treatise is to enumerate the dharmas, considered as 'reals' by the Sarvāstivādins. The dharmas are classified under the heads: 10 *mahābhūmikas*, 10 *kleśa-mahābhūmikas*, 10 *parittakleśas*, 5 *kleśas*, 5 *dṛṣṭis*, 5 *dharmas*, etc. This classification differs slightly from that found in Pāli texts or the *Abhidharmakośa*.[1] Prof. La Vallée Poussin thinks that this must be a very old text, which may be regarded as the source of the Pāli *Dhātukathā* also, as it discusses the *sampayutta* and *vippayutta* relations of the dharmas as has been done in the *Dhātukathā*.

The sixth book *Prajñaptiśāstra* is attributed to Maudgalyāyana. It was translated into Chinese at a very late date (1004-1055 A.D.) by Fa-nu (=Dharmapāla) of Magadha. The Chinese text is incomplete. In Tibetan version this treatise is divided into three parts, viz., *lokaprajñapti*, *kāraṇaprajñapti* and *karmaprajñapti*. The *lokaprajñapti* appears in a well-digested form in the *Abhidharmakośa* (III). Prof. La Vallée Poussin has analysed the first two *prajñaptis* in the *Cosmologie bouddhique* (pp. 275-350).[2] In the *lokaprajñapti* the cosmological ideas of the Buddhists are given, in the *kāraṇaprajñapti* the characteristics that make a Bodhisattva are discussed while in the *karmaprajñapti* there is an enumeration and classification of different kinds of deeds.

The seventh book *Saṅgītiparyāya* is attributed to Mahākauṣṭhila by Yaśomitra and Buston, and to Śāriputra by the

1 Cf. *Kośā* (Transl.), ii, p. 150 fn. See *Infra*, p. 141-2.

2 *Kośa*, Intro. p. xxxvii ff.

Chinese writers. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (660-663 A.D.). This text was compiled, according to the introductory remarks, immediately after Buddha's death to avert disputes among the disciples regarding the Buddhist teachings and disciplinary rules. The scene of this text is laid at Pāvā, where the dissensions among the Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputtas started after the death of their teacher. It arranges the *dharmas* both doctrinal and disciplinary, numerically in the *Ekottara* style, i.e., gradually increasing the number of dharmas from one to ten. The contents of this text agree to a large extent with those of the *Saṅgīti* and *Dasuttara suttantas*[1] of the *Dīghanikāya*.

Besides these seven recognised texts of the Sarvāstivādin Abhidharmapiṭaka, there were a few other digests and commentaries dealing with the topics of the Abhidharma. The exhaustive commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna-sūtra* was, of course, the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, compiled according to Paramārtha, by the Kātyāyanīputra himself with the assistance of Aśvaghoṣa of Sāketa. Among the digests, the most important work is Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, which has got a *bhāṣya* written by Vasubandhu himself and a *vyākhyā* written by Yaśomitra. Then there are two other texts viz., *Abhidharma-nyāyānusāra* and *Abhidharma-samaya-pradīpikā*, attributed to Saṃghabhadra an opponent of Vasubandhu. Saṃghabhadra wrote these works to refute some of the theses of Vasubandhu, specially those which were in support of Sautrāntika views.

There was an earlier digest called the *Abhidharmasāra* written by Dharmaśrī. It contained eight chapters, viz., *dhātu, saṃskāra, anuśaya, ārya, jñāna, samādhi*, miscellaneous, *śāstra-varga* or *vāda-varga*[2].

1 Cf. Daśottara-sūtra in *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 590.

2 For details see La Vallée Poussin's Intro. to the *Kośa*, p. lxiii.

Among other works of note belonging to this school we may mention *Śāriputrābhidharma*, *Abhidharmāmṛtaśāstra* of Ghoṣa, *Abhidharmahṛdaya* of Dharmottara and *Lokaprajñāpti-abhidharmaśāstra* of an unknown author.

Doctrines

In the history of the secession of schools, it has been shown that the Sarvāstivādins belonged to the orthodox group, hence there are many points of agreement between the Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda doctrines.

I. *Sabbam atthi*

The principal point of difference between the two schools is that the Sarvāstivādins maintain the existence of 5 *dharmas* in their subtlest forms at all times, whether in the past, present or future, while the Theravādins deny any such existence. The former accept the fundamental creeds of Buddhism, *viz.*, *anatta* and *anicca* of all worldly things, and their contention is that the things constituted out of the *dharmas* at a particular time are subject to disintegration but not the *dharmas* themselves, which always exist in their subtlest state. *Vedanā*, for instance, may be *kuśala*, *akuśala* or *avyākṛta* at a particular time and place but it exists at all times.[1]

The *Kathāvatthu* (I. 6) presents the arguments and counter-arguments of the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins thus: The Sarvāstivādins maintain that all *dharmas* exist but not always and everywhere and in the same form. In reply to the question whether khandhas which are all different by nature exist uncombined (*ayogam*), they answer in the negative. This, however, gives an opportunity to the Theravādins to show the fallacy

1 See *Points of Controversy*, Appendix, pp. 375-7.

that if all exist then both *micchādiṭṭhi* and *sammādiṭṭhi* exist together. Then again by equating past and future to present, the Theravādins show that if past and future exist then their existence should be predicated in the same way as of the present,[1] which the S. deny, saying that past and future exist but not exactly in the same way as one would speak of the present.

The Th. take recourse to the second argument saying that let the 'present material aggregate' (*paccuppanna-rūpa*) be treated as one inseparable object; now, after some time has elapsed, this material aggregate becomes past, i.e., gives up its presentness (*paccuppannabhāva*) to which the S. agree; then in the same way can it be said that the material aggregate also gives up its materiality (*rūpa-bhāva*)? The S. deny the latter inference, reasoning thus,—let a piece of white cloth, be regarded as one inseparable object; now, when this cloth is coloured, it gives up its whiteness (like '*paccuppannabhāva*' in the former case), but does it give up its clothness (like '*rūpabhāva*' in the former case)? This disarms the opponents. The Th. however follow up this argument of the S. by *suddhikanaya* (pure logic) saying that if the material aggregate (*rūpa*) does not give up its materiality (*rūpabhāva*),[2] then *rūpa* becomes permanent, eternally existing like *nibbāna*—a conclusion not accepted by the S., as according to the latter *rūpabhāva* is different from *nibbānabhāva*.

The next question put by the Th. is whether past (*atīta*) gives up its pastness (*atītabhāva*)? The S. answer in the negative, but take care to note that when they say that *atītabhāva* exists they mean that *anāgatabhāva* (futurity) and *paccuppannabhāva* (presentness) do not exist like the *atītabhāva*, and similarly when they predicate existence of *anāgatabhāva*, they mean *atīta-*

1. This is repeated with each of the khandhas.
2. Cy. rūpakkhandhena saṃgahitattā.

bhāva and *paccuppannabhāva* do not exist like *anāgatabhāva*. This general statement is then applied to each of the khandhas. The Th. round up the discussion by their usual *suddhikanaya* saying that *atīta* or *atītabhāva* then would be the same as *nibbāna* or *nibbānabhāva* a conclusion rejected by the S. The Th. then take to *vacanasodhana* (clearing up of verbal errors) saying that (1) if the existence of past (*atīta*) and non-past (*nvātīta*) as also future (*anāgata*) and non-future (*nvānāgata*) is denied then the S. should not say that past and future exist; so also (ii) if they do not accept the identity of *atīta, paccuppanna* and *anāgata,*[1] they cannot say that *atīta* and *anāgata* exist.

The next argument of the Th. is that if the S. admit that *paccuppannañāṇa* (present cognition) exists and it has the function of knowing things (*paccupannaṃ ñāṇaṃ atthi, tena ñāṇena ñāṇakaranīyaṃ karoti*) and then why not the *atītañāṇa* and *anāgatañāṇa*, the existence of which is affirmed by the S., should not have the function of knowing things in analogy to that of *paccuppannañāṇa*?[2] This the Th. consider as illogical and reject the contention of the S. that '*atītaṃ ñāṇaṃ atthi*'.

The Th. now take up the cases of the Arhats, Anāgāmis, etc., and show that according to the S. who state *atīta rāga* exists in an Arhat, that *atīta byāpāda* exists in an Anāgāmī and so forth, an Arhat should be *sarāgo*, an Anāgāmī should be *byāpannacitto* and so on, but this inference is not accepted by the S.

1 By taking recourse to the discussion whether *hutvā hoti hutvā hoti* and *na hutvā na hoti, na hutvā na hoti*, the Th. show logically the untenability of the assertion of the S.

2 In the text, this argument is elaborated by the application of this general statement to each of the sense-organs, (paras 23-28) as also to *hattha, pāda, pabba, kāya, āpo, tejo* and *vāyu* (paras 47-49).

The last argument resorted to by the Th. is that if the existence of *atīta, paccuppanna* and *anāgata khandhas, dhātus, āyatanas* be admitted, then the S. should say that there are (3 × 5 or) 15 khandhas, (3 × 18 or) 54 dhātus; (3 × 12 or) 36 āyatanas which the S. reject saying that they may accept the position that *atīta* or *anāgata* exists from one standpoint and does not exist from aother standpoint (*atthi siyā atītaṃ* or *siyā nvātītaṃ* or *nvanāgatan ti*). The Th. then bring in their *suddhikanaya* by citing the instance of *nibbāna* and establishes the futility of the assertion of the S. that past and future exist. Both the Th. and S. then quote passages from the Sutta Piṭaka in support of their own contentions, one however remaining unconvinced by the other. From the controversies dealt with above the following may be taken as the opinion of the S.:

1 The past and future, as usually understood, do not exist, though they are perceptible in the present.[1] In the same sense, the non-past and non-future should also be taken as non-existing.

2 It is the *bhāva* of each of the five khandhas and not the khandhas persist in the past, present and future.

3 An object (*vastu*) may lose its pastness, presentness, or futurity but not its objectness (*vastutva*) but that objectness is not identical with *nibbāna* or *nibbānabhāva*.

4 An Arhat e.g., for instance, has *atita rāga* but he is not therefore to be regarded as '*sarāgo*'.[2]

The S. admit impermanency (*anityatā*) of the constituted things but they contend that the "dharmas" (or bhāvas) of the

1 E.g. *anāgataṃ hutvā paccuppannaṃ hoti* but *anāgata* is not identical with *paccuppanna* in the ordinary sense, though in *paccuppanna* there is (the dharma of) *anāgata* so in that sense *paccuppanna* is *anāgata*.

2 Cf. the views of Śaila schools re. *anusaya*, pp. 92-94.

past are transmitted into the present and likewise the "dharmas" of the future are latent in the present. This we may illustrate, by citing the example of a sweet mango—the past mango seed transmits into the present "mangoness" if not the "sweetness" and similarly the "future mango" receives its "mangoness" from the present: the mango seed can never produce any other fruit though there may be a change in the quality and shape and colour of the mango. The S. speak of a being in the same way. According to them a being is composed of five *dharmas* (not five khandhas), viz., (1) *citta* (mind), (ii) *caitasika* (mental states), (iii) *rūpa* (matter), (iv) *visaṃprayuktasaṃskāra* (states independent of the mind),[1] and (v) *asaṃskṛtas* (the unconstituted).[2] The five dharmas (not elements as usually understood) persist in a

1 In Vasumitra this appears also as a separate opinion of the S.: The phenomena *jāti*, *jarā*, *sthiti*, *anityatā* are *cittavisaṃprayuktas* but included in *saṃskāraskandha*. One of these four items, *viz.*, *jarā* is discussed in the *Kvu.*, (VII. 8) in the topic "jarāmaranaṃ vipāko ti?" an opinion of the Andhakas, the *Kvu.*, supporting the opposite view that "jarāmaranaṃ" is not *vipāka*.

2 These five are sub-divided into seventy-five thus:—

I. Rūpa (11): (*a*) *viṣaya* (5) (*b*) *indriya* (5) (*c*) *avijñapti* (1)

(*a*) *viṣaya* (5)	(*b*) *indriya* (5)
(i) rūpa	(i) cakṣurindriya
(ii) śabda	(ii) śrotrendriya
(iii) gandha	(iii) ghrāṇendriya
(iv) rasa	(iv) jihvendriya
(v) sparśa	(v) kāyendriya

II. Citta (1)

III. Caitasikas (46):

(*a*) *Mahābhūmika* (10)

(i) vedanā	(vi) mati or prajñā
(ii) saṃjñā	(vii) smṛti
(iii) cetanā	(viii) manaskāra
(iv) sparśa	(ix) adhimokṣa
(v) chanda	(x) samādhi

being, the present being the resultant of the past, and potential of the future. An adept after becoming a *sotāpanna* remains so

(*b*) *Kuśalamahābhūmika* (10)

(i) śraddhā
(ii) vīrya
(iii) upekṣā
(iv) hrī
(v) apatrāpya
(vi) alobha
(vii) adveśa
(viii) ahiṃsā
(ix) praśrabdhi
(x) apramāda

(c) *Kleśa-mahābhūmika* (6)

(i) moha
(ii) pramāda
(iii) kauśīdya
(iv) aśrāddhya
(v) styāna
(vi) auddhatya

(*d*) *Akuśala-mahābhūmika* (2)

(i) ahrīkatā
(ii) anapatrāpya

(*e*) *Upakleśa-bhūmika* (10)

(i) krodha
(ii) mrakṣa
(iii) mātsarya
(iv) īrṣyā
(v) pradāśa
(vi) vihiṃsā
(vii) upanāha
(viii) māyā
(ix) śāṭhya
(x) mada

(*f*) *Aniyata-bhūmika* (8)

(i) kaukṛtya
(ii) middha
(iii) vitarka
(iv) vicāra
(v) rāga
(vi) pratigha
(vii) māna
(viii) vicikitsā

IV. Citta-viprayukta (14):

(i) prāpti
(ii) aprāpti
(iii) sabhāgatā
(iv) asaṃjñika
(v) asaṃjñi-samāpatti
(vi) nirodha-samāpatti
(vii) jīvita
(viii) jāti
(ix) sthiti
(x) jarā
(xi) anityatā
(xii) nāmakāya
(xiii) padakāya
(xiv) vyañjana-kāya

V. Asaṃskṛta (3):

(i) ākāśa
(ii) pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha
(iii) apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha.

See Rosenberg, *Die probleme der buddhistischen philosophie*, pp. 128-9. Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, *Abhidharma-kośa*, Table III.

in his following existence proving thereby that his past *dharma* continues and the three *saṃyojanas*[1] remain ineffective. It may be argued by the Th. that the three *saṃyojanas* have altogether disappeared; then the Sarvāstivādins may cite the instance of the Sakadāgamin as a better illustration. A Sakadāgamin reduces *rāga, dosa* and *moha* to the minimum, and in his following births that state continues, proving thereby the continuity of past "dharmas". Now we may pass on to the case of Arhats. The Arhats, it will be seen, become completely free from *rāga, dosa* and *moha;* according to the Th. they are destroyed for ever but according to the S., these *rāga, dosa* and *moha* persist though in an ineffective form and these may reappear and cause an Arhat fall from the Arhathood—a topic discussed in the *Kvu.* (I. 2) and attributed by Buddhaghosa to the S., *viz., Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti?*[2]

In Kārikas 25-27 of the fifth Kośasthāna of the *Abhidharma-koṣa,*[3] there is a detailed exposition of the main thesis of the Sarvāstivādins, viz., *Sarvam asti:* The contention of the S. that the dharmas exist in the past, present and future rests on certain statements found in the Āgamas, one of which is as follows: —

रूपमनित्यमतीतमनागतम् । कः पुनर्वादः प्रत्युत्पन्नस्य । एवंदर्शी श्रुतवान् आर्यशावकोऽतीते रूपेऽनपेक्षो भवति । अनागतं रूपं नाभिनन्दति । प्रत्युत्पन्नस्य रूपस्य निर्विदे विरागाय निरोधाय प्रतिपन्नो भवति ।

1 *Viz., sakkāyadiṭṭhi, sīlabbataparāmāsa, vicikicchā.*

2 For its exposition, see ante, p. 84 f.

3 See Stcherbatsky, *Central Conception of Buddhism,* Appendix, pp. 76-91; La Vallée Poussin's Fr. transl. of *Kośa,* V. 25-27; Rāhula Sāṅkrityāyana, *Abhidharmakośa.*

The exposition given in the *Kathāvatthu* speaks of "*bhāvāny-athātva*" of Dharmatrāta, see p. 145.

[*Rūpa* (material constituents of a being) whether past or future is impermanent, not to speak of the present. A learned Śrāvaka, who realises this, remains unconcerned of past *rūpa,* does not rejoice at his future *rūpa* and exerts to rid his mind of the present *rūpa*].[1]

On the authority of this statement taken literally (*kaṇṭhataḥ*) the S. contend that if past *rūpa* do not exist, there is no necessity of instructing an adept to remain unconcerned of the same. In the same way it may be said of the future and the present.[2]

The same statement when interpreted (*arthataḥ*) yields a further argument, *viz.,* every *vijñāna* (perception, cognition) requires the combination of two things, the sense-organ and its object. Now, one speaks of *mano-vijñāna* (mental perception, cognition) of past acts or things. This also implies the existence of past acts or objects, otherwise how could there be *mano-vijñāna* of the same. The same argument is applicable to future acts or objects.[3]

Then again if there be no past, how can one speak of an effect due to past good or bad deeds. At the moment

1 See *M. Vr̥.*, p. 444; cf. Bhaddekaratta-sutta in *Majjhima,* iii, p. 187:

Atitaṃ nānvāgameyya, nappaṭikaṅkhe anāgataṃ
Yad atītaṃ pahīnaṃ taṃ, appattañ ca anāgataṃ,
Paccuppannaṃ ca yo dhammaṃ tattha tattha vipassati
Asaṃhīraṃ asaṃkuppaṃ taṃ vidvā manubrūhaye.

2 *Kośa-vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 468: अतीतं चेद्भिक्षवो रूपं नाभविष्यन्न श्रुतवानार्यश्रावको ऽतीते रूपेऽनपेक्षोऽभविष्यत्। यस्मात्तर्ह्यस्त्यतीतं रूपम्। तस्माच्छ्रुतवानार्यश्रावको ऽतीते रूपेऽनपेक्षो भवति। अनागतं चेद् रूपं नाभविष्यन्न श्रुतवानार्यश्रावकोऽनागतं रूपन्नाभ्यनन्दिष्यत्। यस्मात्तर्ह्यस्त्यनागतं रूपम्। तस्माच्छ्रुतवानार्यश्रावकोऽनागतं रूपं नाभिनन्दति। प्रत्युत्पन्नं चेद् भिक्षवो रूपं नाभविष्यदिति विस्तरः।

3 *Ibid.,* p. 469: न द्वयं प्रतीत्य मनोविज्ञानं स्यात्। यदतीतानागतालम्बनमिति विशेषः। ततो विज्ञानमेव स्यात् आलम्बनाभावादिति।

when the effect is produced there is the *vipākahetu*, which is past.[1]

For the reasons stated above, the S. affirm the existence of past and future *dravyas* only and not of *bhāva, lakṣaṇa*, or *avasthā*.

Among the Sarvāstivādins again, there are four different opinions, which are as follows:—

(i) *bhāvānyathātva:* Bhadanta Dharmatrāta maintains that the past, present and future are differentiated on account of the non-identity of *bhāva* and not of *dravya* e.g. when a vase of gold is broken and transformed into a figure of gold, colour remaining the same or when milk is transformed into whey, changing the taste, strength and digestibility but not its colour. In the same way when future *dharma* is changed to present, the *anāgata-bhāva* only is abandoned and the *vartamāna-bhāva* is acquired, *dravya* remaining identical; in the same way the change of the present into past may be explained, i.e., when the present *bhāva* is abandoned and the past *bhāva* is acquired, the *dravya* remains identical.

(ii) *lakṣaṇānyathātva:* Bhadanta Ghoṣaka and others maintain that the *dharmas* in their transition from past to present, and present to future, undergo changes in characteristics (*lakṣaṇas*) only. A dharma, when it is past, is associated (*yukta*) with the *lakṣaṇas* of the past, but it is not dissociated (*aviyukta*) from the *lakṣaṇas* of the present and future, so also a future *dharma* is associated (*yukta*) with the *lakṣaṇas* of the future but not dissociated from the *lakṣaṇas* of the present and past; in the same way one can speak of the present. By way of illustration, it may

1 *Kośa-vyākhyā*, (Jap. ed.), p. 469: विद्यमान-स्वलक्षणं शुभाशुभमतीतं कर्म। विपक्तिकाल उत्पद्यमानफलत्वात्। वर्त्तमान धर्मवदिति।

be said that when a man is attached (*rakta*) to a woman, he is not detached (*avirakta*) from other women.[1]

(iii) *avasthānyathātva:* Bhadanta Vasumitra and others maintain that past, present and future of a *dharma* is indicated by its difference in condition (*avasthā*). If in a certain state (*avasthā*) a *dharma* is not active (*kāritraṃ na karoti*), it is future (*anāgata*), if the *dharma* is active it is present (*vartamāna*) and if the *dharma* has ceased after being active (*kṛtvā niruddhaḥ*), it is past. In short, there is change of states (*avasthāntara*) but not change of objects (*dravyāntara*). A *dharma* is described as past, present and future, in accordance with the state attained by it at a particular moment, and not on account of the differences in characteristics.

Changes in *dharma* occur also on account of changed conditions (*avasthāntara*) due to change in places (*sthānāntara*), but actually there is no change (*nasvabhāvānyathātva*), e.g., when a cipher is put in the place of ten or hundred or thousand, it carries different values, but it actually remains the same, hence there is *avasthāntara* and not *svabhāvāntara*.

(iv) *anonyathātva:* Bhadanta Buddhadeva and others maintain that the past, present and future are spoken of relatively[2] i.e., a *dharma* is described as past, present or future with reference to that which precedes and that which follows. Future is established relatively (*apekṣya*) to past and present; the

1 *Kośa-vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 470: तद्यथा पुरुष एकस्यां स्त्रीयां रक्तः शेषास्वविरक्त इति। एकस्यां स्त्रीयां अस्य रागाध्यवसानं वर्तते। शेषासु स्त्रीषु रागप्राप्तिरेवास्ति। न समुदाचार इति।

2 This, according to Fa-pao, is the opinion of Saṃghabhadra. According to P'ou-koung this opinion is also expressed in the *Vibhāṣā*. Cf. *Kośa-vyākhyā*, p. 470: पूर्वमपरं चापेक्ष्यातीतानागतवर्तमाना उच्यन्ते। पूर्वमेवातीतं वर्तमानं चापेक्ष्यानागत इति। पूर्वं चातीतमपरं चानागतमपेक्ष्य वर्तमान इति। अपरमेव वर्तमानमनागतं चापेक्ष्यातीत इति। पूर्वापरापेक्षोऽन्यथान्यथिकस्य व्यवहारः।

past relatively to present and future and the present relatively to past and future.[1] The same woman, e.g., is called a daughter and mother, when she is referred to in relation to her mother and daughter respectively. Hence there is actually no change in a *dharma* (*na dravyāntaraḥ*); past, present and future of a *dharma* indicate only its relation to other *dharmas*.

Vasubandhu regards the first opinion (*bhāvanyathātva*) as similar to that of the Sāṅkhyan thinkers and takes it as upholding the theory of transformation (*pariṇāmavāda*). The second opinion he criticises as marked by confusion of time (*adhva-saṃkara*) because the characteristics (*lakṣaṇas*) of past, present and future are always present. According to the fourth opinion, he says, all the three past, present and future exist at the same time, so it is wrong. He therefore accepts Vasumitra's opinion (*avasthānyathātva*) and rejects the other three.[2]

II. *Maitrī* (love) and *Karuṇā* (compassion)

The S. in consonance with the Th. regard Buddha as a human being but they attribute to him divine, sometimes superdivine, powers. They look upon the Bodhisattvas as *puthujjanas*, who must destroy the worldly ties like an average adept in order to step into the *samyakatvaniyāma* or *sotāpannahood*.

According to the S. "sentient beings are not objects of *maitrī* and *karuṇā* and so forth on the part of the Buddha," and further "if anyone adheres to the view that there are sentient beings he cannot realize emancipation.'

The former opinion is opposed in the *Kvu*. (XVIII. 32: *Natthi Buddhasa Bhagavato karuṇā ti*) on the ground that the

1 See *Kośa-vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 470-1.

2 Śāntarakṣita in his *Tattva-saṅgraha* has criticised the opinions of all the teachers mentioned above, including that of Vasubandhu.

Buddha is described in the texts as 'kāruṇiko' and that he sometimes enters into *mahākaruṇāsamāpatti* and so he has *karuṇā* for sentient beings. In the Pāli texts, the practice of four *brahmavihāras: maitrī, karuṇā, muditā* and *upekkhā* form an essential part of the Theravāda code of spiritual practice. It is by means of *brahmavihāras* that an adept is able to look upon all beings as one and the same, in other words, develops *samatājñāna*.

As regards the second opinion we may state that the doctrine of *anattā* teaches that there are actually no individual beings, and that it is *avijjā* which makes one think of the existence of beings. The S. are only stating the axiomatic truth that in Buddha's eye, no individual beings exist and as such they cannot be the object of his *maitrī* and *karuṇā*.

There are three other views relating to Buddha's teachings, which are opposed to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas[1] and are in consonance with the human conception of Buddha. They are,

(i) The Buddhas cannot expound all doctrines with a single utterance.

(ii) The world-honoured One utters words which are not always in conformity with the truth.

(iii) The *sūtras* delivered by Buddha have *nītārtha*[2] and there are even some *anītārtha-sūtras*.

III. *Arhats*

According to the Sarvāstivādins, Vasumitra says,—

(i) A srotāpanna has no chance of retrogression while an arhat has.

1 All these views have been discussed before, see ante, pp. 74 f.

2 The word *nītārtha* means expressions which do not convey the real sense directly as the *neyyārtha* would do. *Nītārtha* corresponds to *sammuti* or *saṃvṛti-satya*.

(ii) All arhats do not gain *anutpāda-jñāna.*

(iii) An arhat is governed by the *pratītyasamutpādāṅga* (members of the causal law).

(iv) Certain arhats perform meritorious deeds.

(v) Arhats are not free from the influence of past *karma.*

(vi) Arhats gain *naivaśaikṣa-nāśaikṣajñāna.*

(vii) Arhats gain the four fundamental dhyānas: they cannot realse the fruits of dhyāna.

The first opinion that arhats may have retrogression is the same as that of the Mahāsaṅghikas and others (discussed above, pp. 64, 85). The S. like the M. postulate the existence of two classes of arhats with different degrees of attainments.[1] According to the S., all arhats are not completely perfect—an opinion not accepted by the Theravādins though the latter have no objection to distinguish arhats as *Sa*(=*sva*)-*dhammakusala* and *Paradhammakusala.* It is interesting to find this opinion discussed also in the *Milindapañha*,[2] where it is said that there are arhats who may not be aware of the name and gotra of any and every person, the various roads and so forth, but there may be some conversant with the *vimuttis.*[3]

1 See *Kośa,* vi. 64: The Ubhayatobhāgavimutta-arhats realise nirodhasamāpatti and remove both kleśāvaraṇa (obstacle of passions) and vimokṣāvaraṇa (obstacle to the knowledge of *akarmaṇyatā* of *nāma* and *rūpa*) while the Prajñāvimukta-arhats are those who remove only kleśāvaraṇa by means of prajñā; see also ante, p. 86. For the six kinds of arhats, see *Kośa,* vi. 56ff.

2 *Milindapañha,* p. 267: Avisayo mahārāja ekaccasa arahato sabbaṃ jānituṃ na hi tassa balaṃ atthi sabbaṃ jānituṃ. Cf. *Kvu.*, II, 2 in ante, p. 86.

3 The five *vimuttis* are,—(1) tadaṅgavimutti or vippasanāñāṇa attained by removing the misconceptions of nicca, nimitta etc.,

The second opinion reiterates the first in another form. The S. hold that some and not all arhats gain the *anutpādajñāna* (lit. knowledge of the cessation of rebirth) but all may have *kṣayajñāna* (lit. knowledge of the extinction of all impurities in oneself). The M. assert that only Buddhas and not arhats can have both *kṣayajñāna* and *anutpādajñāna*.[1]

Regarding the third opinion, Mr. Masuda on the basis of 'Shu-chi says that of the twelve members of the causal law, four, viz., nāmarūpa, ṣaḍāyatana, phassa and vedanā—(or, according to another interpretation, only vedanā) remain active in the case of arhats, the other members, i.e., avijjā, saṃkhārā, taṇhā, upādāna, bhava, jāti, and jarā-maraṇa becoming ineffective. The Chinese interpretation can be accepted, only if "vedanā" is limited to "adukkha-asukha-vedanā" for an arhat is *chaḷupekkho*[2] (endowed with indifference in respect of the six indriyas)' i.e. the organs of sense come into contact with the respective objects but produce neither good nor bad feeling.

The fourth opinion speaks of the *puññopacaya* of an Arhat. The Th. and Mahīśāsakas reject it; so also do the Mahāsaṅghikas.[3] The Arhats are said to have done all that is to be done (*katakaraṇīya*) and are beyond merit and demerit, good or bad; hence to speak of some of them as collecting merits shows that the S. like the Andhakas do not look upon all arhats as completely perfect.

The fifth opinion that arhats are subject to the influence of past *karma* is perhaps based upon some instances found in the

(2) vikkhambhanavimutti or paccavekkhaṇañāṇa, (3) samucchedavimutti or maggañāṇa, (4) paṭipassaddhivimutti or phalañāṇa, and (5) nissaraṇavimutti.

1 See above, p. 78-79.

2 See *Dīgha*, iii, p. 245. *Majjhima*, i, p. 219.

3 See ante, p. 88.

Piṭakan stories that Arhats like Aṅgulimāla and Mahāmoggallāna suffered pain on account of their past karma.[1]

In the sixth opinion, the word *naivaśaikṣa-nāśaikṣa* as translated by Mr. Masuda appears to be ambiguous,[2] and preference should be given to the meaning "nirvāṇa" as assigned to it by the *Mahāvyutpatti*. The sense would then be that according to the S., some and not all arhats attain Nirvāṇa (full emancipation).

The seventh opinion has not been taken up for discussion in the *Kvu.* The *Kośa* (viii. 6) tells us that there are eight fundamental *dhyānas* (*maulasamāpattidravyāṇi*), i.e., four *dhyānas* and four *ārūpyas* (higher dhyānas). The contention of the S. is that all arhats complete the four dhyānas but all do not necessarily attain the fruits of the four dhyānas,[3] which are detailed in the *Kośa* (viii. 27-28), thus: by the first dhyāna, one obtains *dṛṣṭa-dharma-sukhavihāra,*[4] by the second *jñāna-darśana,* (or *divya-cakṣurabhijñā*);[5] by the third *prajñā-prabheda,*[6] and by the fourth *anāsravatā.*[7]

1 See *Milindapañha,* p. 134: Na hi mahārāja sabbantaṃ vedayitaṃ kammamūlakaṃ. See also *Kvu.,* viii. kammahetu arahā arahattā parihāyatīti?

2 "For arhants there are things which are no longer to be learnt and things which are still to be learnt." *Asia Major,* p. 49.

3 *Dīgha* iii. 222, *Aṅg.,* ii. 4: Atth' āvuso samādhibhāvanā bhāvitā bahulīkatā diṭṭhadhammasukhavihārāya saṃvattati ñāṇadassanapaṭilābhāya satisampajaññāya āsavānaṃ khayāya saṃvattati.

4 lit. enjoyment of happiness in the present body (Pāli: diṭṭhadhammasukhavihāra).

5 lit. insight into the real state of things i.e. free from any *vikalpa.* (=Pāli: ñāṇadassana).

6 lit. special or detailed knowledge of the things of the world—the corresponding Pāli expression is satisampajañña.

7 lit. purity (Pāli: āsavānaṃ khaya).

IV. *Samyakatvanyāma*[1] (destined to attain nirvāṇa)

Vasumitra attributes the following opinions to the Sarvāstivādins:—

(i) A person can acquire the *samyakatvanyāma* through the meditation of *śūnyatā* and *apraṇihitatā;* a person in the *samyakatvanyāma* is called *pratipannaka* up to the fifteenth (or the last) moment of the *darśanamārga*. In the sixteenth moment he is called *phalastha* when he is in *bhāvanāmārga*.

(ii) A person can acquire the *samyakatvanyāma* and can also gain arhatship independently of the four dhyānas.

(iii) A being (in Rūpa or Arūpa-dhātu) can gain arhatship but not *samyakatvanyāma*. It is only when he is in Kāmadhātu that he can have *samyakatvanyāma* as also arhathood.

Allied to the above three, there are two other views attributed to the S., *viz.*,

(iv) There are also certain devas who lead a holy life.

(v) There is no one who is free from passion in the Uttarakuru. No saint is born there or in the *Asaññisattva-loka*.

The first three views raise the question of *samyakatvanyāma*, i.e., of persons who are destined to attain Nirvāṇa, and have no chance of being diverted from the Aryan path and going to lower states or joining heretical sects. An adept in *samyakatvanyāma* is the same as *sotāpattimaggapaṭipanna*, i.e., one after destroying the three *saṃyojanas* (impurities), viz., *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* (belief in a self), *sīlabbataparāmāsa* (belief in the efficacy of rituals) and *vicikicchā* (lack of faith in the Triratna) is on the way

1 For references see *Kośa*, vi, p. 181 f.n.

to *sotāpattiphala*. According to the scheme of the S., an adept remains *sotaāpattiphala-pratipannaka* for the first fifteen moments, i.e., up to the development of *mārge anvayajñāna-kṣānti*,[1] when he completes the *darśanamārga;* from the 16th moment he is in *bhāvanāmārga* and is a *srotaāpattiphalastha* or *srotaāpanna*.

The first opinion raises the question whether one can become a *srotaāpattiphalapratipannaka* by the meditation of *śūnyatā* (i.e. *anattatā*) and *apraṇihitatā* i.e. *duḥkhatā* and *anityatā*[2] and not of *animittā;*[3] the answer given by the S. is in the affirmative.

The second deals with the problem whether *samyakatva-nyāma* followed by arhathood can be attained without the practice of the four dhyānas, the S. asserting that it is possible to attain arhathood by means of certain practices other than the usual four dhyānas, e.g. by means of *satipaṭṭhāna* or *brahmavihāra* and so forth.

The third is concerned with the problem whether gods in the Rūpa or Arūpadhātu can gain *samyakatvanyāma* as also arhathood. The S. hold that they can attain the latter but not the former which can only be attained by a being while in the Kāmadhātu. This problem is discussed in the *Kvu*. (I. 3): *N'atthi devesu brahmacariyāvāso ti?*—an opinion held by the Sammitīyas. The opinion of the S. is upheld by the Th. In the *Kvu*. it is contended that "brahmacariyāvāsa" does not mean merely "pabbajjā" (ordination), "muṇḍiyam" (shaven-

1 See *infra*, p. 151. 2 Cf. *Asia Major*, II, p. 40, n. 9.

3 Mr. Masuda on the basis of Fa-jen states that Dharmagupta held that one cannot attain *samyakatvanyāma* without *animittasamādhi*, *Asia Major*, p. 40, n. 9.

20

headedness) and so forth as held by the Sammitīyas, but includes "maggabhāvanā." The Th. and the S. hold that the Anāgāmis do not come to the Kāmadhātu but they remain in Rūpa or Arūpadhātu and by *maggabhāvanā* there, they become Arhats, without becoming a *samyakatvanyāma.*

The fourth opinion of the S. is that the gods except the Asāññīsattas can have *maggabhāvanā,* though not *pabbajjā, muṇḍiyam,* etc.

The fifth opinion is based on a passage of the *Aṅg. Nik.* (iv. 396) and cited in the *Kvu.* (I. 3, p. 99) in which it is said that the inhabitants of Jambudīpa surpass those of Uttarakuru and Tāvatiṃsa heaven in courage, mindfulness and in religious life (*brahmacariyāvāsa*);[1] from this it has been inferred that there cannot be any saint in Uttarakuru.[2] It has been mentioned above that the S. as well as the Th. exclude the Asaññisattas from the gods who follow a religious life, and so, among the Asaññisattas also there cannot be any saint.[3]

V. *Anupubbābhisamaya* (gradual realisation of the truth)

Vasumitra attributes the following views to the Sarvāstivādins:—

(i) The four truths are to be meditated upon gradually.

(ii) The *catur-śrāmaṇyaphala* are not necessarily attained gradually.

1 *Points of Controversy,* p. 73.

2 The S. are making an anomaly in drawing the inferences. If Uttarakuru cannot have any saint how the Tāvatiṃsa can have any?

3 Mr. Masuda points out (in the f.n. *Asia Major,* p. 46) that Uttarakuru is regarded as a land of pure happiness and the Asaññisattas as the highest devaloka with long life and happiness; hence the beings of these two abodes need not take to religious life.

(iii) If one is in *samyakatvanyāma*, he can attain (at once) the fruits of sakṛdāgāmi and anāgāmi on account of (the completion of) the *laukikamārga*.

An adept, according to the S., develop insight into the four truths in a gradual order[1] in 15 moments thus: —

Darśana-mārga:—

(i) Duḥkhe (or five skhandhas, i.e. nāma-rūpe) dharmajñāna-kṣānti[2] (ii) Duḥkhe dharmajñāna	confined to Kāmadhātu.
(iii) duḥkhe anvayajñāna-kṣānti[3] (iv) Duḥkhe anvayajñāna	extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātus.

Srotaāpatti-pratipannaka-darśanamārga:—

(v) Samudaye (sāsravadharmānāṃ hetu i.e., karmakleśe) dharmajñāna-kṣānti (vi) Samudaye dharmajñāna	confined to Kāmadhātu.
(vii) „ anvayajñāna-kṣānti (viii) „ anvayajñāna	extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātus.
(ix) Nirodhe (pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha or karmakleśa-kṣaye) dharmajñāna-kṣānti. (x) Nirodhe dharmajñāna	confined to Kāmadhātu.

---

1 Cf. *Kośa*. vi. 2:

सत्यःयुक्तानि चत्वारि दुःखसमुदयस्तथा ।
निरोधो मार्गः एतेषां यथाभिसमयं क्रमः ॥

2 Kṣānti means "faith (kṣamate = rocate, *Kośa*. vi. 18). An adept at the first moment thinks that he has realised (though actually he has not realised) the fact that the things of the Kāmadhātu i.e. the skandhas are undesirable. It is in the second moment that he realises that the skandhas are undesirable. He acquires now dharmajñāna.

3 After the realisation of the actual state of skandhas of the Kāmadhātu, the adept extends his inner vision to the skandhas of Rūpa and Arūpa-dhātus to realise in the next two moments that skandhas of the higher worlds are also undesirable and hence existence in any of the worlds is to be avoided. In the same way, the other three truths are to be understood.

(xi) Nirodhe anvayajñānakṣānti (xii) „ anvayajñāna	extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātus.
(xiii) Mārge (śaikṣā aśaikṣā dharmā or samatha-vipaśyanāyāṃ) dharmajñānakṣānti (xiv) Mārge dharmajñāna	confined to Kāmadhātu.
(xv) Mārge anvayajñānakṣānti *Srotaāpatti-pratipannaka-darśanamārga:*— (xvi) Mārge anvayajñāna[1]	extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātus.

From the above table it is evident how the S. mark the gradual stages of the development of insight into the four truths. In the *Kvu.* the controversies: *Anupubbābhisamayo ti?* (II. 9) and *Odhisodhiso kilese jahātīti?* (I. 4) and also *Vimuttam vimuccamānan ti?* (III. 4), support the view of the S. about the gradual realisation of the truths. The problem discussed is whether an adept realises the four *sāmaññaphalas* including *vimutti* gradually or not? The Th. contend that there is no bar to the realisation of all the *phalas* at one and the same time. The S. subscribe to this view as will be apparent from the second opinion of the S. quoted above, except that they do not include the fourth phala, viz., *arhathood* or *vimutti*.[2] Buddhaghosa should have pointed out this discrepancy as far as the S. are concerned. According to him, the opinion that the realisation of the *phalas* happens gradually is held by the Sammitīyas.

In the third point, it is stated that according to the S., those adepts only who have completed the *laukikamārga*[3] attain the second and third *phalas* at one and the same time. The Th. hold

1 Cf. *Vibhaṅga*, pp. 235, 315, 329.

2 There may be ascetics who obtain the four fruits gradually (anupūrveṇa catuḥphalaprāpti). *Kośa*, vi. 45.

3 *Kośa.* vi, 45: The *bhāvanā-mārga* is of two kinds: laukika or sāsrava and lokottara or anāsrava.

that *bhāvanāmārga* which commences from the *srotaāpattiphala* stage is *lokottara* and cannot be *laukika;* the S., however, contend that it may be either *laukika* or *lokottara*. A topic allied to this is discussed in the *Kvu.* (I. 5), which will be dealt with hereafter.

VI. *Puthujjana, Laukikamārga* or *Laukikāgradharma*

The S., as pointed out by Vasumitra, hold:—

(i) An average man is able to destroy *rāga* and *pratigha* in the Kāmadhātu.

(ii) A *puthujjana* can die in a good state of mind.

(iii) There is *laukikasamyagdṛṣṭi* and *laukikaśraddhendriya*.

(iv) The *laukikāgradharma* is a stage lasting but one moment (*ekakṣaṇikacitta*).

In the Buddhist texts a puthujjana (an average man), whether a householder or a recluse, who has not yet destroyed the three *saṃyojanas* viz. *sakkāyadiṭṭhi, vicikicchā* and *sīlabbataparāmāsa*[1] in order to become a sotāpanna, can hardly be expected to destroy *rāga, dosa, moha* which impurities are normally removed when an adept reaches the anāgāmi stage. The S. hold that a puthujjana is able to remove from his mind *rāga* and *pratigha* which is the same as *dosa* or *vyāpāda*. The Th. discuss this view in the *Kvu.* in these words: *Jahati puthujjano kāmarāgabyāpādan ti?* (I. 5) concluding that a puthujjana cannot completely eradicate from his mind *rāga* (attachment) and *byāpāda* (hatred), gross and subtle. In course of this discussion, the Th. raise the other question: *Puthujjano kāmesu vītarāgo saha dhammābhisamayā anāgāmiphale saṇṭhāti ti?* (*Kvu.* I. 5, p. 112), i.e. whether an average man who is free from *kāma* attains with

1 See above, p. 152

the realization of the truth the anāgāmi stage or not? The S., as we have seen above, answer the question in the affirmative, but they do not think that such a puthujjana can attain arhathood, but he can attain all the other three phalas at one and the same time. In other words, the contention of the S. is that a puthujjana's attainments through *laukikamārga* may be of so high an order that the moment the truth flashes in his mind he becomes an anāgāmi, when he completes all the necessary conditions for anāgāmihood, including those of the lower two phalas.[1]

The second opinion that an average man dies with a *kusala-citta* is based on many instances of upāsakas dying with a good mental state. The Th. also subscribe to this view, and hence there is no discussion in the *Kvu.*

The third opinion is the same as that of the Th. and is opposed to that of the Śaila Schools (see ante, p. 97).

The fourth opinion is not touched in the *Kvu.* but has been dealt with fully in the *Kośa* (VI. 19) thus:—

कामाप्तदुःखविषयाऽधिमात्रा एकक्षणा तु सा । तथाग्राः etc.

If the conviction (*kṣānti*) concerning *duḥkha* (=skandhas) of the Kāmadhātu be the strongest, it lasts only for a moment; so also are the *agradharmas*, i.e., *laukikāgradharmas*,[2] which though *sāsrava* (impure) are the highest of the worldly dharmas and lead one to the *darśana-mārga* (way to the realisation of truths).

The point is that a puthujjana, according to the S., may attain spiritual progress up to the anāgāmi stage by taking to *satipaṭṭhāna* and such other practices which are *laukika* so long as they are practised by one who is not yet in one of the *maggas* and *phalas*.

1 See *Kvu.*, pp. 113-4.

2 Cf. *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, xiv. 23: laukikāgradharmāvasthā = ānantarya-samādhi. *Kośa*, vi. p. 166, n. agradharma = dharma-smṛtyupasthāna.

VII. *Anuśaya* and *Paryavasthāna*

The S. are of opinion that:—

(i) All the *anuśayas* are *caitasika;* they are *cittasamprayukta* and are also objects of thought (*ālambana*).

(ii) All the *anuśayas* can be included in the *paryavasthānas* but all *paryavasthānas* are not *anuśayas.*

The above two opinions are diametrically opposed to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas, and in full agreement with those of the Th. The topics are dealt with in the *Kvu.* fully (see ante, p. 94f.), in which it is shown that *anuśayas* are not without *ārammaṇa;* they are not *avyākata* (neither good nor bad); they are the same as the *paryavasthānas* (=*pariyuṭṭhānas*) which again are not *cittavippayutta.* The S. distinguish the *anuśayas* from *paryavasthānas,* saying all *paryavasthānas* are not *anuśayas* while the *vice versa* is true.

VIII. *Meditation*

The Sarvāstivādins hold that

(i) In the state of *samāhita* one can utter words.

(ii) No man ever dies in the state of *samāhita.*

(iii) It may be said that four *smṛtyupasthānas* can include all the dharmas.

(iv) All the *dhyānas* are included in the *smṛtyupasthānas.*

(v) There are four *lokottara-dhyānas.*

(vi) The *bodhyaṅgas* are acquired in seven *samāpattis* and not in others.

The first opinion is in agreement with that of Saila schools, and as such has been refuted by the Th. in the *Kvu.* (see ante, pp. 97-98).

The second is opposed by the Rājagirikas and the Th. and as such is discussed in the *Kvu.* (XV. 9): *Saññāvedayita-*

nirodhaṃ samāpanno kālaṃ kareyyā ti? The Th. contend that a meditator while in the *saññāvedayitanirodhasamāpatti* cannot have any death-like (*maraṇantiko*) contact, feeling, perception, etc. or is not affected by poison, weapon-stroke or fire; hence to speak of him as dying while in meditation is wrong. The opponents contend that there is no such law (*niyāma*) that a meditator while in *saññāvedayitanirodha* will not die.

The third topic is discussed in the *Kvu.* (I. 9): *sabbe dhammā satipaṭṭhānan ti?*—an opinion attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Andhakas. The interpretation of Buddhaghosa is that the opponents meant by *satipaṭṭhāna* the objects which form the basis of *sati* (*satiyā paṭṭhāna, satigocara, satiyā patiṭṭhāna*).[1] In this sense the second opinion may be explained as that the *satipaṭṭhānas* include all forms of meditation, i.e., an adept practising *satipaṭṭhāna* needs not have recourse to other meditational practices. The S. may well point to the well-known statement found in many places of the Nikāyas (vide *Majjhima*, I, pp. 55-6), that there is only one way to the attainment of purity and that is the practice of *satipaṭṭhāna* (*ekāyano ayaṃ maggo sattānaṃ visuddhiyā..............yadidam cattāro satipaṭṭhānā*).[2]

The fourth opinion needs hardly any comment. It refers to the first four dhyānas when they are practised by adepts who are in one of the *maggas* and *phalas*. The *dhyāna* of a *maggaṭṭha* or *phalaṭṭha* is regarded as *lokottara* (supramundane).

The fifth opinion evidently refers to the contention discussed in the *Kośa* (VIII. 6) that of the eight *dhyānas* or *samāpttis*, the

1 *Kośa*, vi. 14: Le smṛtyupasthāna est triple: *smṛtyupasthāna* en soi (*svabhāva*), par connexion (*saṃsarga*), en qualité d'object (*ālambanasmṛtyupasthāna*).

2 Cf. *Kośa*, vi. p. 158. n. 1: एकायनोऽयं भिक्षवो मार्गो यदुत स्मृत्युपस्थानानि। केवलोऽयं कुशलराशिः यदुत चत्वारि स्मृत्युपस्थानानि।

first seven are capable of elevating the mind of the adept to the purest state but not the eighth in which *saṃjñā* is in the feeblest form and as such the meditation of *naivasaṃjñā-nāsaṃjñāyatana* is ineffective. Consequentlcy the attainment of the *bodhyaṅgas* takes place while the adept rises from one dhyāna to the next up till the seventh leaving nothing for the eighth.

IX. *Vijñāna*

The S. assert, as stated by Vasumitra, that

(i) The five sense-perceptions (*pañcavijñānakāyas*) conduce to attachment (*sarāga*) and not to detachment (*virāga*), because these only perceive the characteristics (*lakṣaṇas*) of objects and have no independent thinking faculty of their own.

If the reason adduced by the S. that the *vijñānakāyas* by themselves cannot produce *virāga*, how can they induce *sarāga?* Hence, the reasoning of the Sarvāstivādins is not quite clear, and it would be better to accept what the *Kvu.* says on the point (see ante, p. 99-100).

X. *Avyākṛta, Asaṃskṛta,* and *Antarābhava*

The following opinions are attributed to the Sarvāstivādins: —

(i) There are indeterminable problems (*avyākṛtadharmas*).

(ii) The law of causality (*pratītyasamutpādāṅgikatva*) is undoubtedly constituted (*saṃskṛta*).

(iii) The *saṃskṛtavastus* are of three kinds; the *asaṃskṛtavastus* are also of three kinds.

(iv) Only in Kāma- and Rūpa-dhātus there is an intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*).

The first two opinions are opposed to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas and agree with those of the Th. (discussed above, pp. 101-2).

The third also is not accepted by the Mahāsaṅghikas and agreed to by the Th. (see ante, pp. 101-2). The difference between the Th. and the S. lies in the fact that the latter makes the modification in accordance with their doctrine "sabbaṃ atthi" discussed before (pp. 137 f.), according to which, the constituted things (*saṃskṛtavastu*) should be classified as three, viz., those of the past, those of the present and those of the future (see Masuda, p. 40, n. 2).

The fourth opinion of the S. that there is *antarābhava* in the Kāmadhātu and Rūpadhātu is neither accepted by the Mahāsaṅghikas nor by the Th. (see ante, p. 102). It has some agreement with the opinion of the Sammitīyas.

XI. *Other opinions*

There are a few other opinions held by the S. These are,—

(i) All the *dharmāyatanas* (i.e. *vedanā, saṃjñā, saṃskārā*) can be understood and attained.

(ii) Even heretics can gain five supernatural powers (see above, p. 116; Wassilijew, *Der Buddhismus*, p. 272, n. 3).

(iii) Good (*karma*) can also become the cause of existence—an opinion objected to by the Mahīśāsakas.[1]

THE DHARMAGUPTAS

The third in importance among the schools of this group is the Dharmaguptas. It has been shown in the account of the First Council that certain supporters of Purāṇa and Gavampati did not accept *in toto* the Vinaya rules as adopted by Mahākassapa.[2] In the *Abhidharmakośa* (iv. 39) there is a reference to the Dharmaguptas mentioning that they would not accept the Prātimokṣa rules of the Sarvāstivādins as authoritative on the ground that the original teachings of Buddha were lost.

1 See above, p. 116. 2 *EMB.*, I, p. 333.

About the literature of this school, the only information we have is that it had a Vinaya text of its own (Nanjio, 1117) and that the *Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra* belongs to this school. This sūtra was translated into Chinese between 280 and 312 A.D.[1] Prof. Przyluski furnishes us with the information that the canon of this school had the following divisions:

Vinaya-piṭaka	Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa Khandhaka Ekottara
Sūtra-piṭaka	Dīrgha-āgama Madhyama-āgama Ekottara-āgama Saṃyukta-āgama Kṣudraka-āgama
Abhidharma-piṭaka	Difficult (texts) Not difficult (texts) Saṃgraha Saṃyukta

Prof. Przyluski, on the basis of the commentary of K'ouei-ki on Vasumitra's treatise, remarks that this school was noted for its popularity in Central Asia and China. De Groot remarks in his *Code du Mahāyāna en chine* (p. 3) that the Prātimokṣa of the Dharmaguptas was actually in use as the disciplinary rules in all the convents of China. The first formulæ translated into Chinese in 152 A.D. by K'aung-seng-kai who was a Sogdian, belonged to this school, so also was the other text (*Kie-mo*) translated in 254 A.D. by T'an-tai, who was a Parthian. Hence, it is inferred that this school was established in the Iranian countries in the third century A.D. Buddhayaśas, a native of Kipin (mod. Kashmir), introduced the Vinaya of this school into China and from this Prof. Przyluski concludes that this school had its centre in the north-west.[2] He also identifies Dharmagupta with Yonaka

1 Translated into English by Beal under the title "*The Romantic Legend of Śākya Buddha.*"

2 *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 325-6.

Dhammarakkhita, mentioned in the Ceylonese chronicles as the apostle sent to Aparāntaka. The reason adduced by him for this identification is that the region between the North-West and Avanti was traversed by the Yavanas, Śakas and Pallavas about the beginning of the Christian era, and the preacher is described as a Yonaka and then again Dhammarakkhita and Dharmagupta are identical in meaning (i.e. *rakkhita = gupta*).

Doctrines

About the doctrines of this school. Vasumitra writes that these were mainly the same as those of the Mahāsaṅghikas, though it was a branch of the Sarvāstivādins. The doctrines specially attributed to them are as follows:—

(i) Gifts made to the Saṅgha are more meritorious than those to the Buddha, though Buddha is included in the Saṅgha.[1] This is a view contrary to that of the Mahīśāsakas and also to that expressed in the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅgasutta*[2] inspite of the fact that Buddha asked Mahāpajāpati Gotamī to offer the robe meant for him to the Saṅgha.

(ii) Gifts made to a *stūpa* are meritorious. This opinion is opposed to that of the Śaila schools (see above, p. 105).

(iii) *Vimukti* (emancipation) of the *Śrāvakayāna* and *Buddhayāna* is the same, though there may be difference in the paths leading to emancipation. This opinion is in agreement with that of the Sarvāstivādins.[3]

(iv) Heretics cannot gain the five supernatural powers.[4]

(v) The body of an *arhat* is pure (*anāsrava*).[5]

1 See above, p. 116, also *Kośa* (Fr. Transl.), iv. 117.

2 *Majjhima*, iii, p. 253.

3 See above, p. 116.

4 See above, pp. 116, 161; for opinions of other schools on this point see Masuda, p. 42 n.

5 See above, p. 89 n., also *infra*, p. 169.

(vi) Realisation of the truths (*abisamaya*) takes place not gradually but all at once. This is contrary to the opinion of the Sarvāstivādins (discussed above, p. 154-5) but is in agreement with that of the Theravādins.[1]

THE KĀŚYAPĪYAS

The Kāśyapīya school was known by three other names, Sthāvirīya, Saddharmavarṣaka, or Suvarṣaka. It issued out of the Sarvāstivādins on account of certain opinions which were more in agreement with those of the Sthaviravādins or Vibhajyavādins than with those of the Sarvāstivādins. This seems to be the cause of their being called a Sthāvirīya. Its third name, Suvarṣaka, appears in the works of Tāranātha and Ch'en-lun, while Saddharmavarṣaka in Bhavya's treatise.[2]

About the literature of the Kāśyapīyas Prof. Przyluski writes that it had a canon similar to that of the Dharmaguptas, and had the following divisions:

Vinaya-piṭaka	Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa Kaṭhina Mātṛkā Ekottara
Sūtra-piṭaka	Dīrgha-āgama Madhyama-āgama Ekottara-āgama Saṃyukta-āgama Kṣudraka-āgama
Abhidharma-piṭaka	Sapraśnaka-vibhaṅga Apraśnaka-vibhaṅga Saṃgraha Comparative tables

1 This doctrine is not mentioned by Vasumitra. It is found in the *Kośa*, vi. 27, see *Vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 542.

2 Prof. Przyluski identifies the Kāśyapīyas with the Haimavatas (see *infra*, p. 170).

Doctrines

To the Kāśyapīyas Vasumitra attributes the following doctrines: —

(i) Arhats have both *kṣayajñāna* and *anutpādajñāna*, and are not subject to passions.

(ii) *Saṃskāras* perish every moment.

(iii) The past which has not produced its fruit exists, the present exists, and some of the future exists. This opinion is discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* (I. 8) and is the only doctrine attributed in this text to the Kassapikas.[1]

THE SAṂKANTIKAS OR SAUTRĀNTIKAS

In the Pāli tradition the Saṃkantikas are described as an offshoot of the Kassapikas, and from the Saṃkantikas branched off the Suttavādīs. Vasumitra writes[2] that at the beginning of the 4th century (i.e. after Buddha's death), one school named the Sautrāntika, otherwise called the Saṃkrāntivāda, issued again from the Sarvāstivāda; (the founder of this school) declares himself: "I take Ānanda as my preceptor." From these two traditions, it seems that the Suttavādīs are identical with the Sautrāntikas, having branched off from the earlier school the Saṃkantikas, who may also be equated to the Dārṣṭāntikas of Vasubandhu.[3]

Doctrines

Vasumitra characterises the Sautrāntikas as the school which admits the transference of *skandhamātras* from one existence to another as distinguished from the Sammitīyas who maintain the transference of *pudgala*. Both of these views are wholly opposed to the cardinal doctrine of the early Buddhists, viz.,

1 *Kvu.* I. 8: Avipakkavipākaṃ atthi, vipakkavipākaṃ natthīti anāgatam atthīti ādisu ekaccam atthīti uppādinadhamme sandhāya vadatīti.

2 Masuda, p. 17.

3 See *Kośa*, Index.

kṣaṇika (momentary) existence of skandhas (constituents of a being), i.e., the *skandhas* disintegrate every moment to give rise to another. The Sautrāntikas, in deference to this old *kṣaṇika* theory, add that the *skandhas* in their gross form do not pass from one existence to another; the *mūlāntika* (original or the subtlest form of) skandhas all the five of which are of one nature (*ekarasa*), in other words, which are in reality one substance and not five different substances pass from one existence to another. Bhāvaviveka in his *Tarkajvāla* (see Obermiller, *Analysis of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, pt. iii, p. 380) states that the school admitted the reality of the individual which is something inexpressible but neither identical nor different from the *skandhas*.

The second doctrine attributed by Vasumitra to this school is "apart from the aryan paths there is no eternal destruction of the skandhas." This shows that according to the Sautrāntikas, the *skandhas*, gross or subtle end in *nirvāṇa*. This view is also allied to the doctrine of the Sammitīyas that the *pudgala* ceases in *nirvāṇa*. So we may state that according to the Sautrāntikas, the subtle *skandhas* like the *pudgala* of the Sammitīyas may continue through several existences but totally cease to exist in Nirvāṇa.

For this doctrine of transference of *skandhamātras* through several existences, the Sautrāntikas are also called Saṃkrāntivādins or Saṃkrāntikas.

Kośa on the Sautrāntika doctrines

Though Vasubandhu belonged to the Sarvāstivāda school, in his writings occasionally he gave preference to the Sautrāntika views. For this, he was severely criticised by Saṃghabhadra, who was a staunch Sarvāstivādin. In the *Kośa*, Vasubandhu has referred to the Sautrāntika doctrines on several occasions and pointed out the differences between the Sarvāstivāda and Sautrān-

tika views. Prof. La Vallée Poussin has summed up these references in his introduction to the French translation of the *Kośa*. As these throw welcome light on the Sautrāntika doctrines a gist of the same is given here:—

(i) The Sautrāntikas do not accept the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Sarvāstivādins as authoritative (*Kośa*, i. 3). On this point Vasubandhu supports the Sautrāntikas.[1]

(ii) The *asaṃskṛtas* have no real existence. There is a long controversy in the *Kośa* (ii. 55) between the Sarvāstivādins and the Sautrāntikas as to whether the *asaṃskṛtas* have any cause or fruits.

(iii) The Sautrāntikas deny the *citta-viprayuktas* (i.e. *saṃskāras* not associated with mind, e.g. *prāpti, sabhāgatā, jīvitendriya*, etc.) as real as contended by the Sarvāstivādins (*Kośa*, ii. 35-36).

(iv) The Sautrāntikas like all other schools reject the Sarvāstivāda view that past and future exist (*Kośa*, v. 25).

(v) By admitting the existence of the past and of *prāpti*, the Sarvāstivādins explained the function of causality. The Sautrāntikas denied both of these and asserted instead the existence of the subtle *citta* or *bīja* or *vāsanā* and explained thereby the working of the formulae of causation (*Kośa*, ii. 36, 50).

(vi) The Sautrāntikas carry the *kṣaṇikatva* doctrine to the extreme point, asserting that it almost verges on zero, and as such, objects can have, in fact, no duration (*sthiti*). It further asserts that as destruction of objects takes place almost immediately, there is no necessity of any effective cause.[2]

1 Acc. to the Sautrāntikas, *buddhavacana* is vāg-vijñapti, see *Kośa*, i. 25; iv. 2.

2 See *Kośa*, iv. 2-3. The *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* cites this passage from a sūtra of the Sautrāntikas: पञ्चेमानि भिक्षवः संज्ञामात्रं प्रतिज्ञामात्रं संवृतिमात्रं व्यवहारमात्रं । कतमानि पञ्च । अतीतोऽध्वा अनागतोऽध्वा सहेतुको विनाशः आकाशं

(vii) The Sautrāntikas deny the existence of *avijñapti* (non-communicating corporeal and vocal acts)[1] as a real (*dravya*). They hold in agreement with the Theravādins that an *avijñapti* act is mental (*cetanā*), a *kāyasaṃcetanā*.

(viii) According to the commentary of the *Vijñaptimātratā-śāstra*, the Sautrāntikas are divided in their opinion relating to the conception of *citta* (mind) and *caittas* (mental states). According to the Dārṣṭāntika-Sautrāntikas, *citta* only exists but not the *caittas*, but according to other Sautrāntikas *caittas* also exist and their number according to some is three, viz., *vedanā*, *saṃjñā* and *cetanā*, while according to others it is four, ten or fourteen. Some Sautrāntikas admit the existence of all the *caittas* of the Sarvāstivādins (for details, see *Kośa*, transl., ii. 23, fn.).

(ix) The Sautrāntikas hold that the body of an arhat is pure, as it is produced by knowledge.[2]

(x) There may be many Buddhas simultaneously.[3]

THE HAIMAVATAS

Bhavya and Vinītadeva enlist the Haimavatas as a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas (Group I Schools) while Vasumitra remarks that the principal doctrines of this School were the same as those of the Sarvāstivādins.[4] He adds that the original (*mūla*) Sthaviravāda changed its name to Haimavata.[5] In the Ceylonese chronicles, however, the Hemavatikas are counted as one of the later sects, which came into existence some time after the appearance of the first eighteen schools. In view of these con-

पुद्गल इति । Cf. *Vedāntasūtra*, ii. 2, 23; *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* (Viz. S.S.), 383. See also *Kośa*, ii. 46; *Madhyamakavṛtti*, pp. 29, n. 5; 173, n. 8; 222, 413.

1 For details, see *Kośa*, iv. 3.

2 See above, p. 89 n. 164.

3 See above, p. 75.

4 Masuda, p. 53.

5 Masuda, p. 16; *Points of Controversy*, p. xxxvii.

flicting statements, and the acceptance of some doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas, it seems that this school might have branched out of the Sarvāstivādins or Sthaviravādins but doctrinally was inclined more towards the Mahāhaṅghikas than towards the Sarvāstivādins.

Prof. Przyluski, however, identify the Haimavatas with the Kāśyapīyas on the following grounds:—

(i) In the Ceylonese chronicles, the apostles sent to Himavanta are Majjhima and Dundubhissara of the Kassapagotta.

(ii) On the relic caskets discovered in the stūpa of Sonari and Sanci are inscribed (a) *sapurisasa Kāsapagotasa savahemavatācariyasa* and (b) *sapurisasa kotiputasa Kāsapagotasa savahemavatācariyasa.*

(iii) There are other inscriptions which mention Majjhima and Dundubhissara.

He adds that there can be no doubt about the fact that the monks of Kassapa-gotta were responsible for the propagation of Buddhism in the Himavanta. This school also claims Kassapa as its founder, so the same school was known by two names, one local as Haimavata and the other after its founder Kassapa as Kassapiya (= Kāśyapīya). The former name fell into diseutude, and so the Chinese pilgrims refer to it by the other name only, the Kāśyapīyas.[1]

The conclusion drawn by Prof. Przyluski from the inscriptional evidences does not appear to be logical. In the inscriptions it is stated that some monks of the Kassapagotta propagated Buddhism in Himavanta but there is nothing to show that the Kassapagotta monks necessarily belonged to the Kāśyapīya school. Hence the identification of Kāśyapīyas with the Haimavatas is not tenable.

1 *Le Concile de Rājagṛha,* p. 317-18.

Doctrines

Vasumitra treats the Kāśyapīyas and the Haimavatas as separate schools upholding different doctrines. He attributes to the Haimavatas a few doctrines which are in close agreement with those of the Sarvāstivādins, e.g.,

(i) The Bodhisattvas are average beings (*pṛthagjanas*);

(ii) Bodhisattvas have neither *rāga* nor *kāma* when they enter their mothers' womb;

(iii) Heretics cannot gain the five supernatural powers;

(iv) There is no *brahmacariyāvāsa* among the gods; and

(v) *Arhats* have ignorance and doubt; they are subject to temptation; they gain spiritual perception with the help of others; and the path is attained by an exclamation.[1]

THE UTTARĀPATHAKAS

From the geographical evidences collected by Dr. B. C. Law[2] about the Uttarāpatha, it appears it might have originally indicated the high road running north from Magadha to the north-west but later on it denoted the area west of Pṛthudaka (Pehoa, about 14 miles west of Thaneswar) and "comprised the Punjab people including Kashmir and the adjoining hill states with the whole of eastern Afghanistan beyond the Indus, and the present Cis-Sutlej States to the west of the Saraswati."[3]

The name "Uttarāpathakas" appears only in the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* and not in any other text, not even in the Ceylonese chronicles. Evidently Buddhaghosa had in mind some monks who could not be classed as adherents of the doctrines of a particular school or probably he meant, like the Andhakas, a

1 The last two opinions are in agreement with those of the Mahāsaṅghikas. See above, p. 85.

2 *Geogr. of Early Buddhism*, p. 48-9.

3 Cunningham's *Ancient Geogr. of India*, p. 13.

group of schools popular in the north. From the several doctrines attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Uttarāpathakas, it appears it was an eclectic school having doctrines taken from both the Mahāsaṅghika and Theravāda groups and really mark an intermediate stage between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The following are some of such doctrines:—

Re. Buddha. It is the attainment of *bodhi* or knowledge of the *maggas* and omniscience alone that make a Buddha (iv. 6) and that Buddhas are above *maitrī* and *karuṇā*[1] (xviii. 3, 4).

Re. Bodhisattvas. On the basis of the stories of the previous births of Gautama Buddha the U. remark that the Buddhas are always endowed with the *mahāpuruṣa lakṣaṇas* (iv. 7).

Re. Arhats. All *dhammas* (not his body, dress, etc.) possessed by an arhat are pure (*anāsava*) (*K.* iv. 3). The arhats are able to end their lives in the same way as Buddha did, (xxii. 3), as described in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta.* They admit there may be persons claiming arhathood falsely (xxiii. 2). Taking the instance of Yaśa's attainment of arhathood they held that a householder (*gihī*) can attain Arhathood without giving up the householder's life. The Th. point out that Yaśa may have the *gihī* signs externally but his mind was free from the ties of a householder (iv. 1). Then on the basis of the existence of *Upahacca(Uppajja)-parinibbāyīs,* the Uttarāpathakas hold that a being, usually a god, at the very moment of his birth, can attain arhathood. They also hold that beings while in the womb or beings just born may attain arhathood on account of their acquisition of sotāpannahood in their previous lives.[2]

Re. Samyakatvanyāma: The putthujjanas, who are *aniyata* (not destined to attain Nibbāna) or who are doers of evil acts, may ultimately become *niyata* and realise the truth. This

1 See above, p. 43. 2 See above, p. 89 n.

they state on the basis of some statements of Buddha who foretold to certain puthujjanas that they would realise the truth ultimately, e.g., in the case of Aṅgulimāla (v. 4; xix. 7).

Allied to the above views, there are two other views of the Uttarāpathakas: one is that the persons who have to take seven more births to attain Nibbāna (*sattakkhattuparama*) can reach the goal after seven births and not earlier or later. The Th. are not prepared to accept this view on the ground that such persons may quicken their space by greater exertion or retard their progress by performing evil deeds (xii. 5). The second is that an adept may attain the four fruits of sanctification by one *magga*. The Th. contend that an adept can attain the *phalas* of the corresponding *maggas* only, i.e., a sotāpanna gets rid of *sakkāyadiṭṭhi*, etc. and he cannot attain the *phalas* of the *sakadāgami* or *anāgami magga*, i.e., elimination of *rāga, dosa* and *moha*. The Uttarāpathakas do not subscribe to the latter view (xviii. 5).

Re. Anuśayas. According to the U. *anuśayas* are *anārammaṇa* and *cittavippayutta* (see above, p. 94) (ix. 4); past *dharmas* may be *ārammaṇa* (ix. 6).

Re. Asaṃkhatas:

(i) *nirodhasamāpatti* is unconstituted (vi. 5)

(ii) space of all kinds, is unconstituted (vi. 6).

Re. Immutability (niyata): All dharmas like *rūpa* and *vedanā* do not change their nature (xxi. 7); *karmaic* effects also are unalterable (xxi. 8).

Re. Gatis (spheres of existence): The U. count the *asūragati* as one additional to the usual five, totalling in all six *gatis*.

Re. Buddhavacana. The U. assert that the religious teachings were revised thrice in the three Councils (xxi. 1).

CHAPTER X

DOCTRINES OF GROUP IV SCHOOLS

The Vātsīputrīya-Sāṃmitīyas, Dharmottarīyas and other Schools

This group of schools comprised mainly the Vajjiputtakas or Vātsīputrīyas, Dhammuttarīyas, Bhadrayānikas, Channagarikas and Sammatīyas. Of these the Vātsīputrīyas, later on known as Vatsīputrīya-Sāṃmitīyas,[1] became the most prominent school of this group. The monks adhering to these schools were probably those Vajjiputtakas who submitted to the decisions of the Second Council and gave up their heresies as distinguished from those who preferred to remain apart and form a distinct Saṅgha of their own.[2] We do not hear much about this school in the early history of Buddhism excepting a few criticisms of its radical doctrine of the temporary existence of a self (*prajñapti-sat-pudgala*) apart from the five *skandhas*. This school became popular and most widespread during the reign of Harṣavardhana (606-647 A.D.) and it is said that the king's sister Rājyaśrī joined the school as a bhikṣuṇī. The Chinese travellers also testify to its wide popularity in India. The earliest evidence to the existence of this school is furnished by a Gupta inscription discovered at Sarnāth,[3] which states that this school ousted the Sarvāstivādins about 300 A.D., who had established themselves there after supplanting the

1 *ERE.*, XI, p. 168; *Kośa-vyākhyā*, IX, 3 (Jap. ed.), p. 699: Vātsīputrīya 'Āryasammatīyaḥ.

2 See *Infra*.

3 *EI.*, VIII, p. 172; Sahni, *Catalogue of the Museum at Sarnath*, p. 30.

Theravādins. This inscription is interesting from more than one point of view. It shows that Sarnāth was a centre of the Theravāda group, the earliest popular school,[1] which gradually yielded its place to the next popular school, Sarvāstivāda. Though Sarvāstivāda retained its popularity and influence all over Northern India it had, at least at Sarnāth, given place to the Sāmmitīyas.

The Sāmmitīyas ascribed the origin of their school to Mahākaccāyana, the famous monk of Avantī. This established their close connection not only with the Pāli school but also with Avantī, for which their alternative name is given in some sources as Avantaka.[2] Their robes had 21 to 25 fringes and their badge was Sorcika flower like those of the Theravādins.[3]

Yuan Chwang writes that he carried to China 15 treatises of this school[4] while I-tsing speaks of its separate Vinaya text.[5] The latter tells us further that this Vinaya had rules regulating the use of undergarment, girdle, medicines, and beds for the members of the sect in a way peculiar to itself. The only treatise that is expressly mentioned as belonging to this school in Nanjio's *Catalogue* and extant in Chinese translation is the *Sāmmitīya-śāstra* or *Sāmmitīyanikāyaśāstra* containing the tenets of this sect. Most of the passages cited in the *Kathāvatthu* as giving the views of the Sāmmitīya school are traced in the Pāli Piṭaka. It is very likely that the Sutta-piṭaka of the Sammitīyas was substantially the same as that in Pāli.

1 See *Infra*.

2 According to Vinītadeva, the Sāmmitīyas were sub-divided into three sects, Kuru-Kullakas, Avantakas and Vātsīputrīyas. See Buston, II, p. 99.

3 Buston, II, p. 100.

4 Watters' *Yuan Chwang*, I, pp. 20, 21.

5 Takakusu, *I-tsing*, pp. 7, 66, 140.

According to the *Kathāvatthu* and Vasumitra's treatise, the main thesis of this group of schools is that there is a persisting entity (*pudgala*) passing from one existence to another and that it is not possible for the *skandhas* to transmigrate without the *pudgala*. In the *Tarkajvāla* of Bhāvaviveka also, a similar statement is found. It says that the Vātsīputrīyas, Bhadrayānikas, Dharmaguptas and Saṃkrāntivādins admit the reality of the individual.[1] Among the other views of this group we may mention that they like the Theravādins recognised the Arhats as infallible as against the opinion of the Sarvāstivādins. They however adhered to the doctrine that there is *antarābhava* (intermediate state of existence), which was not agreed to by the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas. Their conceptions of Buddha and Nirvāṇa, fruits of sanctification and their attainments, various stages of *dhyānas* (meditation), and beings of the higher worlds had much in common with those of the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins. We reproduce below the doctrines attributed to them in the *Kathāvatthu* and Vasumitra's treatise along with their criticisms.

Doctrines

The cardinal doctrine of this school is that besides the elements composing a being, there is a *pudgala* (an individuality, a personality, a self) which is indefinable and which persists through all the existences.[2] It is neither identical with, nor different from, the skandhas as *anātmā* forms the keynote of Buddhist philosophy; this theory has brought forth vigorous criticisms from most of the prominent Buddhist philisophers including Vasu-

1 See Obermiller, *Analysis*, III, p. 380. For detailed discussion see *infra*.

2 *Kośa-vyākhyā*. (Jap. ed.), pp. 697-713.

bandhu[1] and Nāgārjuna.[2] It has also been mooted whether on account of this thesis the Saṃmitīyas (= Vātsīputrīyas)[3] should be regarded as within or outside the pale of Buddhism. According to some thinkers, they should be treated as heretical while according to others they are Buddhists but their *pudgala-vāda*, being a form of *satkāyadṛṣṭi*, acts as a hindrance to the attainment of nirvāṇa.[4]

Profs. Stcherbatsky and La Vallèe Poussin have furnished us in English and French translations with the materials of the *Abhidharmakośa*, and now we have also the original Sanskrit text of its *Vyākhyā* edited by Prof. Wogihara. On the basis of these three texts, a gist of the arguments of this school for establishing the existence of *pudgala* is presented here. This will be followed up by a summary of the arguments and counter-arguments given in the *Kathāvatthu*, which has so far not received much attention.[5]

The *Kośa* opens the controversy with the question, whether the Vātsīputrīyas can be regarded as Buddhists and whether they are entitled to attain emancipation (*mokṣa*)? As has been pointed out above they were regarded by some as Buddhists while by others as non-Buddhists.

The Buddhists believe that there is no *mokṣa* outside the pale of Buddhism, hence the non-Buddhists cannot have emancipation, and that is mainly because the non-Buddhist teachers like

1 *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. ix.

2 *Madhyamakavṛtti*, p. 275, quoting *Ratnāvalī*, p. 267, 283; *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, ix. 60.

3 See p. 174 n.

4 For details and reference, see La Vallée Poussin's preliminary notes in the *Koṣa* (Fr. transl.), ix, pp. 227f.

5 *Kathāvatthu* (P.T.S.), pp. 1-69, translated in *Points of Controversy* by Mrs. Rhys Davids.

Kapila and Uluka believe in the existence of a permanent soul, which according to them, is different from the constituents of a being and is not a term indicating the flux of elements[1] (*skandha-santāna*). The soul, the Buddhists assert, can neither be established by direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) nor by inference (*anumāna*).

Vasubandhu (henceforth abbreviated as V.) first defines the contention of the Vātsīputrīyas (henceforth abbreviated as Vā) thus: Is the pudgala of the Vā. real (*dravya*) or nominal (*prajñapti*)? By real (*dravya*) existence he means existence like that of *rūpa* and such other elements and by nominal (*prajñapti*) he means existence like that of milk, house or army, which has no separate existence of its own apart from its constituents.

If the soul of the Vā. be of the former category (*dravya*), it would be different from the *skandhas* as *vedanā* is from *rūpa*, and is not also all the skandhas taken together. Now, in that case it should be either *saṃskṛta* (constituted), or *asaṃskṛta* (unconstituted). It cannot be the latter, for it would make the Vā. hold the *Śāśvata* view, which is heretical.

If the soul of the Vā. be of the latter category (*prajñapti*), its existence is dependent on the skandhas and so cannot have any independent existence of its own, i.e. it does not exist (*pudgala iti prajñaptir asat-pudgalaḥ prāpnoti*).

The Vā. contend that their Soul is real (*dravya*) but it is neither identical with, nor different from, the skandhas as fire is to fuel. Fire exists as long as the fuel lasts, so also soul

1 *Vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 697 quotes this *stotra:*

साहङ्कारे मनसि न शमं याति जन्मप्रबन्धो
नाहङ्कारश्चलति हृदयादात्मदृष्टौ च सत्याम् ।
अन्यः शास्ता जगति च यतो नास्ति नैरात्म्यवादी
नान्यस्तस्मादुपशमविधेस्त्वन्मतादस्ति मार्गः ॥

(*pudgala*) exists as long as there are skandhas otherwise *pudgala* would be either *asaṃskṛta* (unconstituted), *śāśvata* (eternal) or *saṃskṛta* (constituted), *aśāśvata* (= *uccheda*—annihilating).[1] Fire is different from fuel inasmuch as it has the power of burning an object to ashes or producing light, which the fuel does not possess.

Vasubandhu argues that fuel and fire appear at different times (*bhinnakāla*) like seed and sprout. Hence fire is impermanent, and the difference between fuel and fire is one of time and characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*), and again one is the cause of the other.

He then states that according to the Vā., fuel is constituted of three *mahābhūtas* while fire is of the fourth (*tejas*) only, then it follows that fire is different from fuel.

The Vā. reply that fire and fuel are co-existent and the latter is a support of the former (*upādāya; āśritya*), and that one is not wholly different from the other, for fuel is not totally devoid of the fiery element; in the same way *pudgala* should be distinguished from *skandhas*. Vasubandhu challenges the Vā. by citing the instance of a burning log of wood and saying that it represents both fuel and fire and hence they are identical (*ananya*).

According to the Vā., *pudgala* is neither to be described as *anitya*, which is sub-divided into past, present and future nor *nitya*, eternal. It is *avaktavya*, indeterminable, inexplicable. It is not included in the list of constituents of a being but is perceived when only all the constituents are present.[2]

1 Cf. the quotation in the *Kvu.* p. 34:—
Khandhesu bhijjamānesu *so* ce bhijjati puggalo
Ucchedā bhavati diṭṭhi yā Buddhena vivajjitā
Khandhesu bhijjamānesu *no* ce bhijjati puggalo
Puggalo sassato hoti nibbānena samasamo.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 700: स्कन्धतः स्पष्टमन्यत्वं प्रतिज्ञायते वात्सीपुत्रीयैः ॥

The question next raised is, can the pudgala of the Vā. be cognized by any sense-organ (*indriya*), if so, by which? The Vā. reply that it is perceived by all the six sense-organs. They contend that eyes do not care to see *rūpa* (object) or recognise it unless mind (*mana indriya*) is there. Eyes act as the dominating factor when the visual action takes place, hence it is not correct to say that eyes alone see *rūpa*, or for the matter of that, each of of the five sense-organs cannot function in their respective spheres independent of the mind.[1] For cognition of *pudgala*, the Vā. state that all the sense-organs point out to the mind indirectly that there is a *pudgala;* eyes, e.g., discern the *rūpa* (colour-figure) of a body and thereby induces the mind to cognize the presence of an individual (*pudgala*), but that *pudgala* is neither identical with, nor different from, *rūpa*.[2] V. argues that if *rūpa* be the cause of cognition of *pudgala* (रूपाणां कारणत्वमधिक्रियते) one should not say that *rūpa* and *pudgala* are different (*anyaṃ*),[3] again, if cognition of *rūpa* leads at once to the cognition of *pudgala*' (रूपाण्युपादाय पुद्गलोपलब्धिरिति) one should also say that *rūpa* and *pudgala* are identical (*ananyas*)[4] in other words, one is only a modification of the other (रूपान्तरवत्). The Vā., however, would neither identify *rūpa* (colour-figure) with *pudgala* nor treat them

1 See above, p. 101; also Masuda, p. 23 n.

2 चक्षुर्विज्ञेयानि रूपाणि प्रतीत्य पुद्गलं प्रतिविभावयतीत्युपलक्षयति तदुपादानत्वात्। नो तु वक्तव्यो रूपाणि वा नो वेत्येतल्लक्षणत्वादवक्तव्यत्वाच्च। See *Kośa* (Fr. transl.) ix, p. 238 fn.

3 Just as light, eyes and mind which cause a visualisation of an object are not different from the object यदि तावद्रूपाणि पुद्गलोपलब्धेः कारणं भवन्ति न च तेभ्योऽन्यो वक्तव्यः एवं तर्हि रूपमप्यालोकचक्षुर्मनस्कारेभ्योऽन्यं न वक्तव्यम् : *Ibid.*, p, 238 n. See *Vyākhyā*, p. 701.

4 अथ, रूपाण्युपलभमानः पुद्गलमुपलभते किं तथैवोपलब्ध्योपलक्ष्यते आहोस्विदन्यथा। यदि तथैव रूपादभिन्नस्वभावः पुद्गलः प्राप्नोति रूप एव वा तत्प्रसक्तिः। इदं रूपमयं पुद्गलः कथमिदं परिच्छिद्यते। *Ibid.*, p. 239 n. See *Vyākhyā*, pp. 701-2.

as different; in the same way they would neither regard the perception of *rūpa* (colour-figure) as identical with the perception of *pudgala* nor look upon them as different.

V. asserts that if *pudgala* be an entity, it should be either material (*rūpa*) or non-material (*nāma*), but Buddha says *rūpa* or *vedanā* or *saṃjñā* or *saṃsārā* or *vijñāna* is not self—all dharmas are without self—there is no *pudgala*. He further states that *sattva, jīva,* or *pudgala* is a *prajñapti* (designation) applied to the false notion of a self cherished by the unenlightened.

The Vā. in reply state that they were not prepared to accept the statements attributed to Buddha as authentic[1] as these were not to be found in their Piṭaka. They referred to statements, in which Buddha spoke of a person's past existence or recognised *pubbenivāsañāṇa*[2] as one of the higher acquisitions of an adept, and asked, who is it that remembers? Is it pudgala or the *skandhas*? They further argue that if Buddha be regarded as omniscient, i.e. he knows everything past or present, of every place, of every being etc. it also implies a continuity of something, in other words, it implies the existence of a *pudgala*. The Vā. further state that unless there were some form of *pudgala* why the disciples should be instructed to avoid thinking of *rūpavān ahaṃ babhūvātīte 'dhvani* (in the past I possessed a body) and so forth.[3]

V. refutes this contention by saying that *pudgala* here refers only to *skandha-santāna* (continuity of skandhas) and not to anything else. The Vā. then cite the *Bhārahārasūtra,* and assert

1 Cf. *Vyākhyā,* मूलसंगीतिभ्रंशात्।

2 Cf. *Majjhima,* I, p. 22: so evaṃ samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyodāte anaṅganc...pubbenivāsānussaratiñāṇāya cittam abhininnāmeti.

3 Cf. *Mājjhima,* I, p. 8: ahosin nu kho ahaṃ atītaṃ addhānaṃ, ...kiṃ hutvā kiṃ ahosiṃ nu kho atītam addhānam, etc. etc.

that by *bhāra* is meant the constituents (*skandhas*) of a being and by *bhārahāra* the individual (*pudgala*) who is known by a name, gotra etc.[1] If *bhāra* (=*skandhas*) included *bhāra hāra* (=*pudgala*), there was no need of distinguishing the two and so *pudgala* exists apart from *skandhas*, it is neither identical with nor different from *skandhas*.

The Vā. admit the existence of *aupapādika* beings and *antarābhava*,[2] and prove thereby the existence of *pudgala*. They also cite the passage "*ekapuggalo bhikkhave loke uppajjamāno uppajjati bahujanahitāya* (*Aṅguttara*, i. 22) and lay stress on the word "puggala", saying this "puggala" is born (*uppajjati*) and hence there is besides the skandhas something, which may be designated as "puggala". V. refutes all these by appropriate quotations and arguments.

The Vā. further state that if the *pudgala* is only a word meant to designate the five *skandhas*, then why Bhagavā did not identify *jīva* with *śarīra*. V. cites the discussion on the topic from the *Milindapañha*. The Vā. further argue that why pudgala has been declared by Buddha as indeterminable (*avyākṛta*), well, if it does not exist, then why Bhagavā did not declare that *jīva* does not exist absolutely. V. in reply comments on the *Vatsagotra sūtra* and other sūtras dealing with the indeterminable problems.

The Vā. point out that the statement *ātmā* does not exist in reality (*satyataḥ sthititaḥ*)[3] is a wrong view, it indirectly implies the admission of the existence of *pudgala*.

1 Cf. *Vyākhyā* (Jap. ed.), p. 706, bhāraḥ katamaḥ. pañcopādānaskandhāḥ. ......bhārahāraḥ katamaḥ. pudgala iti syād vacanīyaṃ yo 'śav āyuṣman' evaṃnāmā evaṃjātya evaṃgotra etc.

2 Cf. *Kośa*, iii. 10, 12, 18-19, quoting सप्तसत्पुरुषगतिसूत्र ।

3 Cf. *Majjhima*, i. p. 8: *Atthi me attā ti* vā 'ssa saccato thetato

The Vā. next raise the question, if pudgala does not exist, who it is that transmigrates from one existence to another. If the elements only exist, how do you explain when Buddha says "I was at that time the master Sunetro and in that statement why 'I' of the past is identified with 'I' of the present; does it indicate that the elements of the past are the elements of the present?" V. refuted it by saying that just as fire passes from one wood to another, the fire never remaining the same, so the elements pass from one existence to another, nothing remaining identical. If, according to the Vā., Buddhas admit the existence of pudgala they would be subject to the wrong belief of *satkāyadṛṣṭi*.

The Vā. now ask, how can memory be explained without the conception of 'pudgala'. Who is it that remembers; V. answers that it is *saṃjñā* that remembers—*saṃjñā* with attention directed to the object, an idea etc. similar to, or connected with it, provided there is no corporeal pain to impair its capacity.[3]

The Vā. are of opinion that there must be an agent, a doer, a proprietor of the memory. There must be a cognizing agent, an action must have a doer. 'Devadatta walks' implies the exis-

diṭṭhi uppajjati, *natthi me attā* ti vā 'ssa saccato thetato diṭṭhi uppajjati, etc.

1 *Sunetro nāma śāste ti.* Saptasūryodayasūtre yam eva Bhagavān ṛṣiḥ Sunetra nāma babhūveti. See *Kośa* (transl.), V, p. 271; *Kośavyākhyā*, p. 710.

2 *Kośavyākhyā*, p. 710: यथा तु अग्निकोऽग्निरिति विस्तरः। स च देशान्तरोत्पत्तिसंतत्या संचरतीत्युच्यते। तथा सत्त्वाख्यः स्कन्धसमुदायस्तृष्णोपादानः।

3 *Ibid.*, p. 710: तदाभोगसदृश-सम्बन्धि-संज्ञादिमांश्चित्तविशेषः। "आदि" शब्देन प्रणिधाननिबन्धाभ्यासादिग्रहणम्। आश्रयविशेषः शोकतद्व्याक्षेपतश्चादिरेषामिति आश्रयविशेषशोकव्याक्षेपादीनि। तैरनुपहतप्रभावश्चित्तविशेषः।

tence of an individuality. V. replies that it is not so. He states that just as when a fire traverses from one forest to another, no question of individuality arises, similarly Devadatta is a *prajñapti* (like fire) applied to a conglomeration of elements passing from one existence to another and has no individuality.

Now, we shall pass on to the arguments of the Vā. and the counter-arguments of the Theravādins as presented in the *Kathāvatthu*, which being of a much earlier date than that of the *Kośa*, follows a form of controversy, quite different from that of the medieval and modern dialecticians.

The first question put by the Theravādins to the Vātsīputrīyas, known in the Pāli texts as Sammitīyas, is as follows: Can the *puggala* be known in the same way as *that* which is real and ultimate, e.g. *Nibbāna* (or *Rūpa*) is known? (para 1).[1] In other words, the Theravādins want to ascertain whether the Sammitīyas (henceforth abbreviated as Sam.) admit the existence of the *puggala* either as the unchangeable, ever-existing reality like *Nibbāna*, or as a constituted (*sappaccaya-saṃkhata*) object like *rūpa*, or regard it as false as a mirage (*māyāmarīci viya*), or look upon it simply as a hearsay. The Sam. deny practically all the four possibilities though they assert that the *puggala* is known as a real and ultimate fact (*saccikaṭṭhaparamaṭṭhena*).

The Sam. now assail the Th. with the counter-question whether the latter would admit that the *puggala* is *not* known in the same way as *that* which is real and ultimate. The Th. answered in the affirmative as accordihg to them *puggala* is not even an object like *rūpa;* it is a mere *paññatti* (conventional term), a *sammutisacca* (so-called truth).

1 "Para" refers to the paragraphs marked in the P.T.S. edition of the *Kathāvatthu*.

But when the same question is repeated by the Sam. (as in paras 2 and 6),[1] the Th. reply in the negative by saying "na h' evam",[2] because the answer is to be given to a question which included both *sammutisacca* (conventional truth) and *paramattha-sacca* (the highest truth). The questions and answers which follow next have mixture of both *sammuti* and *paramattha* truths, and so they appear contradictory to a superficial reader.

Now the Th. give up the logical tricks and put the question straight (para 11) thus: whether *puggala* is a *paramattha-sacca*,[3] or not, *i.e.* whether or not the puggala is known in the same way as the real and ultimate *everywhere* (*sabbattha*) in and outside *rūpa* (material parts of the body), *always* (*sabbadā*) in this and the following existences, and in *everything* (*sabbesu*) i.e., in all khandhas, āyatanas, dhātus etc. The answer of the Sam. is also definitely in the negative, i.e., they do not consider "puggala" as real in the highest sense, and as existing *everywhere, always* and in *everything* as pointed out by the Th.

The next attempt of the Th. is to find out whether the Sam. regard *puggala* as something existing like any of the 57 elements, *rūpa, vedanā, saññā,* etc. The Sam. deny it saying they do not admit *puggala* as an element apart from the 57 elements,[4] and in support of their contention they quote from the Nikāyas (*Dīgha*, iii, 232; *Majjhima*, i. 341; *Aṅguttara*, ii. 95) the passage "atthi puggalo attahitāya paṭipanno", which indicates that *puggala*

1 The remaining paras 3-5 and 7-10 are mere logical rounding up of the questions and answers put in paras 1 & 2.

2 The question is,—Yo saccikaṭṭho paramaṭṭho tato so puggalo n'upalabbhati saccikaṭṭha-parameṭṭhanāti ti?

3 Perhaps like the *jīvātman* of the Vedānta School of Philosophy.

4 Samayasuttavirodhaṃ disvā paṭikkhepo paravādissa, *Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 16.

exists but not apart from the elements. The Th. also do not clearly state that *puggala* (as a *paññatti*) is different from the elements, the reason assigned by Buddhaghosa[1] being that the questions of the opponents have a mixture of *sammuti* and *paramattha* truths and as such the Th. have no other alternative but to leave them unanswered (*ṭhapanīya*).[2]

The next attempt of the Th. is to show that the Sam. should advocate either *Ucchedavāda* or *Sassatavāda*. With this end in view the Th. put the questions whether *puggala* is identical with *rūpa*, or different from *rūpa*, or *puggala* is in *rūpa* (like the container and the contained) or *rūpa* is in *puggala*. The Sam. reject all the four propositions as otherwise they would become either an Ucchedavādin or a Sassatavādin. Though, according to the Sam., *puggala* is of the same nature (*ekadhammo*) as *rūpa* and other elements,[3] they would not treat it as an element separate from, and independent of, the 57 elements.

The Th. now assail their opponents by questioning on *lakkhaṇas* of the *puggala*, and ask whether the *puggala* is *sappaccaya* (caused) and *saṃkhata* (constituted) like *rūpa*, or is *appaccaya* (uncaused) and *asaṃkhata* (unconstituted) like *Nibbāna*. The Sam. deny both and ask how the Th. would explain the 'puggala' in the statement of Buddha: "Atthi puggalo attahitāya paṭipanno ti.' Is the puggala referred to in this passage *sappaccaya, saṃkhata* or *appaccaya, asaṃkhata?* The Th. deny both, as in their opinion the term *puggala* is only a *sammuti-sacca*, and as such it is non-existing.

1 See his *Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 16.

2 Paras 130-137 dilate on the above question, comparing it with each of the 57 elements.

3 *Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 18.

The next argument put forward by the Th. is whether the statement "*puggala* perceives" is the same as the statement, "that which perceives is *puggala*"[1] i.e. whether the two statements are identical as *citta* is with *mano* or different as *rūpa* is from *vedanā*. Buddhaghosa interprets the position of the opponents thus: the Sam. hold that *puggala* perceives but not everything that perceives is *puggala*, e.g., *rūpa, vedanā,* etc. are not *puggala* but that *puggala* perceives and that which perceives referred only to the percepient (*puggala*), and not to *rūpādi.*[2] The opponents, however, rely on the statement "atthi puggalo attahitāya paṭipanno ti" which, again is counteracted by the Th. by saying that the Sam. should equally rely on the statement "suññato lokaṃ avekkhassu, etc." and admit that there is no *puggala*.

The Th. now proceed to examine the *paññatti* (description) of *puggala*. In answer to the question whether the *puggala* of the *Rūpadhātu* is *rūpī* and likewise of the *Kāmadhātu* is *kāmī* and of the *Arūpadhātu*, *arūpī*, the Sam. affirm the first and the third but not the second. The Sam. argue that *puggala* = *satta* = *jīva* and *kāya* = *sarīra*. Though they do not admit either the identity of, or difference between, *jīva* and *sarīra*, they hold, though not logically tenable, that *kāya* must be different from

1 Puggalo upalabbhati (yo yo) upalabbhati (so so) puggalo ti? *Kvu.*, p. 24.

2 *Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 20: The opponents say: Mama puggalo atthi puggalo 'ti satthuvacanato upalabbhati. Yo pana upalabbhati, na so sabbo puggalo. Atha kho ke hi ci puggalo ke hi ci na puggalo 'ti. Tattha kokāratthe kekāro hikāro co nipātamatto. Koci puggalo koci na puggalo 'ti ayaṃ pan' ettha attho. Idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti: puggalo pi hi rūpādisu pi yo koci dhammo upalabbhati yeva. Tattha puggala 'va puggalo rūpādisu pana koci pi na puggalo 'ti.

puggala as there are such statements as 'so kāye kāyānupassī viharati and so forth', in which *so* cannot but refer to *puggala.*

The next discussion relating to *upādāpaññatti* (rebirth) of *puggala* raises the question of transmigration. The Sam. affirm that *puggala* passes from this world to the next but it is neither the self-same puggala nor a different puggala—a statement similar to what the Th. would say about the passing of the *khandhas* —avoiding the two heretical opinions of *sassatavāda* and *uccheda-vāda* as also the *ekaccasassatikavāda* and *amarāvikkhepadiṭṭhi.*[1] In support of their contention the Sam. quoted the passages in which a "puggala" is said to pass from one world to another (*sandhāvati saṃsarati*).

Accepting the opinion of the opponents that the self-same, or a different, *puggala* does not pass from one existence to another, the Th. point out that they admit that some form of *puggala* referred to in the above-mentioned passages does pass from one existence to another. This *puggala* can then have no death, it once becomes a man and then a god and so forth, which is absurd.[11] In reply the Sam. point out that a sotāpanna-manussa is known to take rebirth as a sotāpanna-deva and question how can this sotāpanna-hood pass from one existence to another unless there exists some form of *puggala* to carry the qualities. In order to show the unsoundness of the statement, the Th. ask whether the passing *puggala* remains identical in every respect[2] and does not lose any of its qualities.[3] The opponents first negative it on the ground that a man does not continue to be a man in the devaloka. But on second thought they affirm it in view of the fact that the carrier of certain qualities from one

1 See my *Early Monastic Buddhism,* I, pp. 51 ff.

2 Anañño = sabbākārena ekasadiso.

3 Avigato = ekena pi ākāreṇa avigato.

existence to another is a *puggala*, an *antarābhavapuggala*.[1] The Sam. take care to keep clear of the two extreme views: *taṃ jīvaṃ taṃ sarīraṃ* and *aññaṃ jīvaṃ aññaṃ sarīraṃ*. They affirm that the transformed *khandhas* and *puggala* and not the identical *khandhas* and *puggala* pass from one existence to another. The *khandhas* are, however, impermanent and constituted while the *puggala* is not so but it is not also permanent and unconstituted. Without khandha, āyatana, dhātu, indriya and citta, *puggala* cannot remain alone but for that reason, the colour and other qualities of the khandha, āyatana, etc. do not affect the *puggala*. Again the puggala is not a shadow (*chāyā*) of the khandhas.

In reply to the question whether *puggala* is perceivable in every momentary thought, the Sam. answer in the affirmative but they would not accept the inference drawn by the Th. that the *puggala* in that case would have momentary existence (*khaṇika-bhāvaṃ*) i.e. would die and be reborn every moment like *citta* (thoughts).

The Sam. now ask the Th. whether they would admit that one (*yo*) who sees something (*yaṃ*) by means of an organ of sense (*yena*) is the *puggala* or not. The Th. after assenting to it as a conventional truth (*sammutisacca*), put the same question in the negative form thus: One (*yo*) who[2] does not see anything (*yaṃ*) by means of an organ of sense (*yena*) is not a *puggala*. The Sam., however, without arguing further quote a few passages in which Buddha said: I (i.e. the *puggala*) see by means of my divine eyes (*dibbena cakkhunā*) beings appearing and disappearing and so forth, and infer therefrom that the seer is the *puggala*.

1 The self which exists between death and rebirth. See above p. 103-4.

2 E.g., a blind man, an asaññasatta.

Their next discussions related to *purusakāra*. The Th. do not admit any *doer*, so they asked the Sam. whether the latter would subscribe to the same opinion. On their denial, the Th. ask whether the Sam. would admit the existence of the doer, and a creator of the doer, which is negated by the Sam. on account of the heretical doctrine of *issaranimmāṇa* (god the creator of the world) but on second thought affirmed it in view of the fact that the parents, teachers etc. are also in a sense the makers (*kattā-kāretā*) of a person. The Th., without going into the implied sense of the replies, say that such a state of things, i.e., a doer having a doer and a deed implies not just a deed but also a doer, would lead to the conclusion that so long there is deed (*kamma*), there is its doer (*kārako puggalo*) and hence there can be no end to *puggalaparamparā* and that would falsify the fact that by the stoppage of the wheel of actions, *dukkha* can be brought to an end. Then again nibbāna, mahāpaṭhavi, etc. must also have a doer. All the inferences drawn by the Th. are rejected by the Sam. In conclusion the Sam. deny that the deed and the doer can be distinct, just to avoid admitting that the *puggala* has mental properties.

In the above, the doer of a deed is enquired into, while in the following discussion identity of the doer of a deed with the enjoyer of its fruit is enquired into.

The Th. deny the existence of a feeler or enjoyer apart from *vipākapavatti*, (that which is realised, the fructification of an effect). The Sam. hold that *paṭisaṃveditabba* is *vipāka* (result) but the *puggala* is not *vipāka*.[1] They further state that Nibbāna or Mahāpaṭhavi, etc. is not *vipāka* like *divine happiness* (dibba-

1 But it may happen that *puggala* who is in the enjoyment of his fruits, say, merits, may be again an object of enjoyment of another puggala, e.g. a son enjoying the fruits of his actions may be the object

sukha) or *human happiness* (manussasukha) so none of them is an object of enjoyment of the *puggala* but again the Sam. do not admit that *sukha* is distinct from the *sukha-enjoyer*. The Th. logically wanted to make their opponents admit that there must be not only an enjoyer of a fruit but also an enjoyer of the enjoyer of the fruit and so on an endless chain, in other words, according to them, as shown above *dukkha* can have no end.

The Th. now put the crucial question thus: whether the doer of a deed is identical with, or different from, the enjoyer of its fruit. The opponents first deny both to avoid contradiction of Buddha's saying: *sayaṃ kataṃ paraṃ kataṃ sukhadukkhaṃ,* etc. but on second thought in view of their theory that there is a common element keeping the link between the present and the future life, they admit it. In short, the Sam. affirm that there is a *kāraka* (doer) and *vedaka* (feeler or enjoyer) of a deed, but the two are neither identical nor different, neither both identical and different, nor not both identical and different.

The Sam. next apply the test of *abhiññā* (supernormal powers), *ñāti* (relatives) and *phala* (attainments) and put the propositions thus:

(i) How can a person perform certain miracles keeping his organs of sense etc. inert and inactive, unless there is something else as *puggala.*

(ii) How can one recognise the existence of parents, castes, etc. without positing that there is a *puggala*; and

(iii) How can a *phalastha* continue to be the same in his more than one birth, unless the existence of a *puggala* is admitted.

of affection of his mother and so forth. This explanation of Buddhaghosa should be compared with the above like the *kāretā* of *kattā.*

The Th. avoid the issuues by putting the counter-arguments that one who cannot perform miracles is not a *puggala,* and in this way they refute the other two propositions.

The next question of the Th. is whether *puggala* is constituted (*saṃkhata*) or unconstituted or neither constituted nor unconstituted (*n'eva saṃkhato nāsaṃkhato*). The Sam. affirm the last alternative but would not treat *puggala* as something apart (*añño*) from the *saṃkhata-khandhas.* They state that the *puggala* has certain aspects of *saṃkhata,* e.g., it is subject to sukha, dukkha, and so forth; again it has certain aspects of *asaṃkhata,* e.g., it is not subject to birth, old age and death (*jāti, jarā,* and *maraṇa*).

In reply to the Th.'s question whether a *parinibbuto puggalo* exists in Nibbāna or not, the Sam. negative both as the affirmation of either would make them either a Sassatavādin or an Ucchedavādin.

Now the Sam. put the counter question: does not a person say that he is feeling happy or unhappy and so forth, how can a person say so unless he is a *puggala* and not a mere conglomeration of separate khandhas. In refuting this contention, the Th. put the same question in a negative form thus: well, if a person does not feel happiness or unhappiness, then there is no *puggala.* The Th. further ask whether Sam. would treat *sukha* and *puggala* as something separate and distinct. The Sam. evade a direct answer and ask, well, when a *puggala* (*koci* or *so*) is said to be *kāye kāyānupassī viharati,* does it not affirm the existence of a puggala?

The controversy is then closed by citations of passages from the Nikāyas, the Th. quoting only those which clearly express *anattā* of all things while the Sam. quote those in which the word *puggalo* or *attbabita* or *so* appeared.

Through these controversies it is apparent that the Sam. are seeking to establish that the five khandhas which are distinct from one another cannot give rise to the consciousness of I-ness, a unity. The facts that a person acts or thinks as one and not as five separate things, and that in many passages Buddha does actually use the words *so, attā* and *puggala,* and that a person's attainments like *sotāpannahood* continue to be the same in different births, that one speaks of his past births and so forth, do lead to the conclusion that besides the five khandhas there exists some mental property which forms the basis of I-ness, and maintains the continuity of *karma* from one existence to another. That mental property, however, is changing with the changing khandhas but in view of the fact that one can think of his past, even of the events of his past births, the changing khandhas alone cannot be made responsible for the memory. The Sam. therefore affirm the existence of a sixth mental property and call it *puggala* which can remain only along with khandhas and so must disappear when the khandhas disappear in Nibbāna. As this mental property or *puggala* is not *kṣaṇika* like the khandhas, it has not all the properties of a *saṃkhata* (constituted object) and again it is not also unchanging and ever existing like Nibbāna so it is not *asaṃkhata*. Therefore the *puggala* must be said as neither *saṃkhata* nor *asaṃkhata*.[1]

1 Cf. Obermiller's *Analysis of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra,* III, p. 380, referring to *Tarkajvāla* and Schayer, *Kamalaśīla's Kritik des Pudgala-vāda.* Obermiller writes 'the Vātsīputrīyas, Bhadrayānikas, Sāṃmitīyas, Dharmaguptas and Samkrāntivādins are those that admit the reality of the 'individual.' They say that the 'individual' is something inexpressible, being neither identical with the five groups of elements nor differing from them. It is to be cognised by the six forms of *vijñāna*. and is subject to *saṃsāra* (phenomenal existence).

Vasumitra summarises the doctrine of the Sammitīyas or the Vātsīputrīyas thus:

1. The *pudgala* is neither the same as the *skandhas* nor different from the *skandhas*. The name *pudgala* is provisionally given to an aggregate of *skandhas*, *āyatanas* and *dhātus*.

2. Dharmas cannot transmigrate from one world to another apart from the *pudgala*. These can be said to transmigrate along with the *pudgala*.

Other doctrines

Vasumitra attributes to the Vātsiputrīyas a few other views which have already been discussed. These are,—

(i) The five vijñānas conduct neither to *sarāga* (desire) nor to *virāga* (removal of desires);[1]

(ii) To become free from desire (*virāga*) one must relinquish the *saṃyojanas* which can be destroyed by an adept when he reaches *bhāvanāmārga* and not while he remains in *darśanamārga;*

(iii) When one has entered the *samyaktvanyāma* he is called *pratipannaka* in the first twelve moments of the *darśanamārga* and when he is in the thirteenth he is called *phalastha.*[2]

(iv) There is *antarābhava.*[3] The Sammitīyas like the Sarvāstivādins hold that every being be he destined for Kāmaloka or Rūpaloka by his *karma*, remains for some time in an intermediate state of existence. At that time the body takes no material form not even the *skandhas*. It is not an independent state

1 See *ante*, pp. 99-101.

2 Cf. Masuda's notes in the *Asia Major*, II. p. 56. In short, the *Sammitīyas* count in all fourteen moments instead of Sarvāstivādin's sixteen; so the 13th moment of the Sammitīyas corresponds to the 15th of the Sarvāstivādins; see p. 155-6.

3 See *ante*, pp. 103-4, 162.

of existence but just a waiting stage preliminary to his existence in one of the two lokas. The Sammitīyas add that those beings who are destined for hells, or Asaññī sphere or Arūpaloka have no *antarābhava*.

(v) *Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti* (*Kvu*. I. 2).[1]

(vi) *N'atthi devesu brahmacariyavāso ti* (*Kvu*. I. 3).[2]

(vii) *Odhisodhiso kilese jahatīti* (*Kvu*. I. 4).[3]

(viii) *Jahati puthujjano kāmarāga-byāpādan ti?* (*Kvu*. I. 5).[4]

DHAMMUTTARĪYA, BHADRAYĀNIYA AND CHAN-NAGARIKA

Vasumitra skips over the special doctrines of these three schools,[5] mentioning in verse only that they differed regarding the attainments of an *arhat*, and the consequent chances of fall from arhathood. It seems that in other matters, these three schools agreed with the views of the Sammitīyas.

VIBHAJYAVĀDA

This is one of the schools enlisted by Bhavya and Vinītadeva, but not by Vasumitra. It does not also appear in the list of schools of the Ceylonese chronicles. Bhavya and Vinītadeva treat it as an offshoot of the Sarvāstivāda school. Prof. La Vallée Poussin has traced in the Chinese commentary of the *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* a passage in which Vibhajyavādins are identified with the Prajñaptivādins.[6] This apparently refers to the Bahuśrutīyavibhajyavādins,[7] by which name the Prajñaptivādins distinguished themselves from the Bahuśrutīyas. Prof. Poussin has shown that the position of the Vibhajyavādins cannot be clearly made out as their doctrines have much in com-

1 See *ante*, pp. 85 f., 149 f.
2 See *ante*, p. 152.
3 See *ante*, p. 156.
4 See *ante*, p. 157.
5 See *ante*, pp. 48-9.
6 *Kośa*, Intro., p. lv.
7 See above, p. 108.

mon with the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, Mahāsaṅghikas, Sammitīyas and others. To add to this confusion, we have the Ceylonese traditions, in which the Pāli School, i.e. the Theravādins preferred to call themselves, Vibhajyavādins.[1] This anomalous position of the Vibhajyavādins, it seems, may be explained by regarding them not as an independent school, but as a term to denote those who did not accept the doctrines of a particular school in toto.[2] To wit, it may be shown that those Sarvāstivādins who did not accept the *sarvam asti* thesis in toto and held instead the opinion that the past which has not yet produced its fruits and the future does not exist were known as Vibhajyavādins, i.e. Sarvāstivāda-vibhajyavādin just as we have Bahuśrutīya-vibhajyavādin. On this analogy we may explain that among the Theravādins perhaps, there were some dissenting groups who were distinguished as Theravāda-vibhajyavādins. The Ceylonese monks of Mahāvīhāra probably preferred to call themselves Vibhajjavādin as we find it clearly expressed in the versified table of contents of chapter III of the Cullavagga[3] and in the colophon of the commentary on the *Tikapaṭṭhāna*,[4] as also in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, (xviii. 41, 44). In the

1 *Mahāvaṃsa*, p. 54.

2 See *Kośa*, Index, p. lvi; V, p. 23-24 fn. quoting *Arthapradīpa*, 3, p. 48. "Les Vibhajyavādins ou bien sont des maîtres divergents du Grand Véhicule, ou bien toutes les écoles du Petit Véhicule sont nommées Vibhajyavādins: ceux-ci ne sont pas une école déterminée. Par conséquent, dans le *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* (Nanjio 1183), les Vibhajyavādins sont expliqués comme Mahiśāsakas; dans la Vibhāṣā, comme Sāṃmitīyas."

3 See *Vinaya*, CV, pp. 72, 312: ācariyānaṃ Vibhajjavādānaṃ Tambapaṇṇidīpapasādakānaṃ Mahāvihāravāsinaṃ vācanā saddhammaṭṭhitiyā ti.

4 *Tika-paṭṭhāna* (Cy), p. 366: ācariyānaṃ vādaṃ avihāya

account of the Third Council, as given in the Ceylonese chronicles[1] as also in Buddhaghosa's commentaries,[2] the Vibhajjavādins were declared as orthodox monks.[3]

As Vasumitra does not count the Vibhajyavādins as one of the sects, he has not mentioned any special doctrines of theirs. It is only in the *Abhidharmakośa* that we come across certain doctrines attributed to this sect. Evidently Vasubandhu had in his mind the Sarvāstivāda-vibhajyavādins. The doctrines as summarised by Prof. La Vallée Poussin are in short as follows:—

i Sound is an effect (saddo vipāko, *Kvu.* xii. 3; *Kośa,* i. 37)

ii The faculties of faith, memory etc. (Śraddhendriya, Smṛtindriya etc.) are pure (*anāsrava*). (*Kośa,* ii. 9).

iii There is no intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*) (*Kośa,* iii. 10).

iv The pratītyasamutpāda is unconstituted (*asaṃskṛta*) (*Kośa,* ii. 28).

v Abhidhyā, vyāpāda, mithyādṛṣṭī are physical acts (*kāyika*).

Vibhajjavādisissānaṃ etc.; p. 367: theravaṃsappadīpānaṃ therānaṃ Mahāvihāravāsīnaṃ vaṃsālaṅkārabhūtena vipula-visuddhabuddhinā Buddhaghoso ti ...... therena katā.

1 *Mahāvaṃsa,* V, 271.

2 *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā,* p. 6.

3 Before Vibhajjavāda came to refer to a sect, it simply meant one who dealt with the metaphysical problems analytically, from a particular standpoint as opposed to one who solved the problems straightaway (*ekaṃsavādin*) by a direct answer. See *Majjhima,* II, pp. 99, 107; cf. *EMB.,* I, p. 124: Vibhajjavyākaraṇīya and Ekaṃsavyākaraṇīya. In the *Majjhima,* I, p. 163; *Papañcasūdanī,* II, p. 171, Buddha declared that he knew *theravāda,* which, according to Buddhaghosa, meant *thirabhāvavāda* (mental steadiness). Though these two terms *Vibhajjavāda* and *Theravāda* were used in the Nikāyas, they did not denote any sect, but we may take them as the source, from which the sectarian name issued later on.

vi Bhagavān is always in meditation (*Kośa*. Fr. transl. iv. p. 40 n) and has no *middha* (*Ibid*).

vii Vibhavatṛṣṇā is abandoned by bhāvanā (*Kośa*, iv. 10-11).

viii Arhats have no fall (*Kośa*. vi. 58).

ix There are 41 Bodhipakṣika-dharmas (*Kośa*. vi. p. 281n: the four additional dharmas are the four ārya-vaṃsas . See *Mahāvyutpatti*).

x There is *rūpa* (matter) in the Ārūpya-dhātu (*Kośa*. viii. 3. See Fr. transl. p. 135 n.).

Some schools like the Andhakas, Mahāsaṅghīkas, Mahīśāsakas point out that *rūpa* exists in arūpyadhātu but in a very subtle state. The contention of the Vibhajyavādins is possibly the same as that of the Tāmraparṇīyas[1] (*Kośa*. i. 39) who state that *mano-dhātu* is a material organ, which they call *hadaya-vatthu* (see *Visuddhimagga*, p. 447). This basis of the *mano-dhātu*, which is material, exists in the Arūpyadhātu.

xi The Ārya of the 4th Ārūpya (i.e. nevasaṃjñānāsaṃjñā-yatana) obtains arhathood without the aid of the *magga*, This is a doctrine of the Mahīśāsakas.

xii There are twelve viparyāsas, (see *Vyākhyā*, p. 454) of which eight are removed by *darśanamārga* and four by *bhāvanāmārga* (*Kośa*. v. p. 23 n.).

xiii *Jñāna* is the same as *dharmas* which are good by nature (*svabhāvataḥ*), while *vijñāna* means those *dharmas* which are good by association (*samprayogataḥ*), i.e., associated with *jñāna* (*Kośa*. iv. p. 33 n. ix, p. 248 n).

xiv Realisation of the four truths takes place all at once and not gradually[2] (*Kośa*, vi, pp. 185, 123).

1 *Vyākhyā*, p. 39: ताम्रपर्णीयापि हृदयवस्तु मनोविज्ञानधातोराश्रयं कल्पयन्ति । तच्चारूप्यधातावपि विद्यत इति वर्णयन्ति । आरूप्यधातावपि हि तेषां रूपमभिप्रेतम् ।

2 See above, pp. 154-6.

CHAPTER XI

DOCTRINES OF GROUP V SCHOOLS

Sthaviravāda or Theravāda

(including Mahāvihāravāsins and Abhayagirivāsins)

According to both Pāli and Sanskrit traditions, the original school, which the Ceylonese chronicles[1] would not count as a schismatic, was called Theravāda or Sthaviravāda.

An alternative name of the Sthaviravādins is given as Vibhajyavādins. It is doubtful whether any independent school went by the name of Vibhajyavāda. It has been shown above that Vibhajyavāda was sometimes affixed to the name of a school to show that certain adherents of a school differed in minor points from the principal doctrines of a particular school and preferred to distinguish themselves as Vibhajyavādin of that particular school. In this way we may explain the Vibhajjavāda of the Ceylonese tradition, that is to say, the Ceylonese did not accept in toto the doctrine of Theravāda and preferred to distinguish themselves as Sthavira-vibhajjavādī or simply Vibhajjavādī.[2] In the *Kathāvatthu* the term Sakavāda is used instead of Sthaviravāda or Vibhajjavāda.[3]

Hiuen Tsang speaks of a group of monks as Mahāyānists of the Sthavira school. From his records,[4] it seems that he divided the monks of Ceylon into two groups, calling the Mahāvihāra-

1 *Dīpavaṃsa,* V. 51: Sattarasa bhinnavādā eko vādo abhinnako. See Watters, I, p. 164.

2 See above, p. 196.

3 *Points of Controversy,* p. xli.

4 Watters, II, p. 234.

vāsins as Hīnayāna-Sthaviras and the Abhayagirivāsins as Mahāyāna-Sthaviras. He came across such Mahāyānist Sthaviras in the Mahābodhi-saṅghārāma, built in Gaya by a king of Ceylon,[1] in Kaliṅga[2] and Surat.[3] In the monasteries of Samataṭa,[4] Drāviḍa,[5] he says, the monks belonged to the Sthavira school without any mention of Mahāyāna. He was aware of the split of the Buddhist church into two schools, Sthaviras and Mahāsaṅghīkas,[6] and quite deliberately used the expression Mahāyānist Sthaviras. His remarks about the division of monks in Ceylon remind us about the Ceylonese tradition that the Abhayagiri monastery became for some time a centre of the Vetulyakas, the immediate forerunners, we may say, of the Mahāyānists,[7] and very probably the Chinese pilgrim referred to the Vetulyakas or the monks generally living in the Abhayagiri monastery as Sthaviras of the Mahāyāna school. By Mahāyānist Sthaviras Hiuen Tsang probably meant those monks who followed Vinaya rules of the Sthaviravādins but held views of the Mahāyānists like *Suññatāvāda* of the Vetulyakas.

In the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *bhāṣya*,[8] certain erudite monks are referred to as Sthaviras e.g. Sthavira Saṃghabhadra, Sthavira Vasubandhu, Sthavira Śrīlāta while the Chinese commentators on the texts point out that by "nikāyāntara," the text referred to the Sthavira school. In the *Kośavyākhyā* (p. 705), there is a reference to the Tāmraparṇīyanikāya. These references, however, are too inadequate for drawing any conclusion.

Leaving aside for the present the Haimavatas, or the Mahāyānist Sthaviras let us turn to the original Sthavira school which

1 Watters, II, p. 138.
2 *Ibid.*, II, p. 109.
3 *Ibid.*, II, p. 248.
4 *Ibid.*, II, p. 188.
5 *Ibid.*, II, p. 226.
6 Watters, I, p. 164; II, p. 161.
7 See above, p. 110.
8 See *Kośa*, Index, *s.v.* Sthavira.

claimed the Pāli scriptures as its own, or to be more precise, to the Sthaviravādins of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. Vasumitra has passed over the doctrines of this school while the *Kathāvatthu* refers to them by the word *sakavāda*. For the purpose of finding out the distinctive doctrines of this school, we shall elicit from the *Kathāvatthu* the views of the *Sakavādins* as against those of other schools on any particular doctrine.

Centres of popularity

The Tibetan traditions ascribe the foundation of this school to Mahākaccāyana[1] who was a native of Ujjeni, son of the priest of king Caṇḍa Pajjota of Avantī. The Pāli traditions, however, give prominence to Upāli, and speak of the succession of his disciples, the chief of whom was Dāsaka. The latter's disciples were Siggava and Caṇḍavajji who were young at the time of the Second Council.[2]

The events of the Second Council, in which the Theravādins became separated from the main body, indicate that the monks of the west, specially of Kauśāmbī and Avantī, formed the nucleus of this sect. The biography of Mahinda, who is mainly responsible for the propagation of this school of Buddhism in Ceylon, also shows that this school was more popular in the west than in the east. Taking into consideration all these facts, it may be stated that the Theravādins had one centre at Pāṭaliputra along with other schools but were chiefly concentrated in and

1 See also *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, p. 61-2.

2 *Aṭṭhasālinī* (p. 32) however gives prominence to the disciples of Sāriputta, the chief of the Ābhidhammikas thus: Sāriputta-Bhaddaji-Sobhita-Piyajāli-Piyapāla-Piyadassi-Kosiyaputta-Siggava-Sandeva-Moggaliputta, etc. Moggaliputta Tissa was a disciple of Siggava and Caṇḍavajji. See *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 40.

around Ujjeni, which became its second but more important centre.

In the Sarnāth inscription, there is a reference to the existence of the Theravādins at that place in the early days, while in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions, mention is made of the activities of this sect in the propagation of Buddhism. In the *Maṇimekhalai,* we find that it had its popularity in countries around Kāñcī, which became one of their principal centres in the post-Christian eras.[1] The fact that Buddhaghosa and Dharmapāla had their training at Kāñcī goes to show that Kāñcī became later on the educational seat of the Theravādins. After Mahinda's demise the school obtained a firm footing in Ceylon and made the Mahāvihāra its chief academic centre. Hiuen Tsang saw one hundred monasteries of the Sthavira school in Drāviḍa, and also in Samataṭa. He says that Dharmapāla was born in the Drāviḍa country.[2] From this survey, it may be stated that the school originated at Pāṭaliputra, became popular in the western countries, making Ujjeni its second centre and then it gradually made headway towards the south, settling in and around Kāñcī, and was ultimately established in Ceylon.

Language

According to the Tibetan traditions, this school had its Piṭaka in the Paiśāci dialect. There is much value in this tradition. Grierson holds that Paiśāci had its home in the North-West (Kekaya and Gandhāra i.e. near Taxila) and that it gradu-

1 See Aiyangar, 'A Buddhist School at Kāñcī (*Proceedings of the 4th Oriental Conference,* Allahabad).

2 Watters, II, p. 226.

ally made its way to the western countries upto the Konkan coast.[1] Guṇādhya, who belonged to Ujjeni, it is said, wrote *Bṛhatkathā* in Paiśāci.[2] On philological ground Sten Konow localises Paiśāci around the Vindhya hills. He holds that Pāli is the literary form of Paiśāci. The traditions preserved in the Ceylonese chronicles also indicate that Pāli had its home somewhere in Avantī. So it is quite possible that the Tibetan tradition refers to Pāli as literary Paiśāci.

Literature

The whole of the Pāli literature belongs to this school and as such it hardly needs any further comment. The only information that we should add is that Hiuen Tsang records that he carried to China fourteen volumes of the Sthavira Sūtras, Śāstras and Vinaya. No Sinologist has so far dealt with this literature and we are still in the dark about the Sthaviras whom the Chinese pilgrim had in view.

Doctrines

The Theravāda doctrines are fairly well known and have been given in detail in the first volume of this work (chs. xii-xv). Our object here will be to mention the differences which this school had with the other schools, as pointed out by Vasumitra and Buddhaghosa. These differences are discussed in detail in connection with the doctrines of each school and so these are not repeated here. It should be noted that the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, Sammitīyas, Mahīśāsakas, Sautrāntikas and the Mahāsaṅghikas have been mainly kept in view.

1 *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 110-120; see also *JRAS.*, 1921, pp. 244-5; 424-8.

2 *ZDMG.*, LXVI, (1910), pp. 114 f.

The views of the Theravādins as against the opinions of the above-mentioned schools are as follows:—

Re. Buddhas:

(i) Buddhas possess *rūpakāya* and worldly attributes and are subject to all the physical frailties of a human being; it is the attainment of *bodhi* that makes a being a Buddha.

(ii) Buddhas are above *maitrī* and *karuṇā,* but they do show *maitrī* and *karuṇā* to beings.

(iii) Buddhas cannot expound all the doctrines by a single utterence.

Re. Bodhisattvas:

(i) Bodhisattvas are average beings, and are subject to *kleśas.*

(ii) They are not self-born (*upapāduka*).

Re. Reals:

Past and future *dharmas* do not exist, not even their *dharmatva.* To say that Arhat has *atīta rāga* though it is ineffective is wrong.

Re. Arhats:

(i) Arhats are perfect beings. hence they cannot have a fall from arhathood. They possess both *kṣayajñāna* (i.e. the knowledge that they have no more *kleśas*) and *anutpādajñāna* (i.e. the knowledge that they will have no more rebirths). There are, however, two grades of Arhats, viz., *svadharmakuśala* and *paradharmakuśala* (see above, p. 86-7).

(ii) Arhats, having reached the stage which is beyond merit and demerit, cannot accumulate merits, or be subject to influence of the past *karmans.*

(iii) All Arhats practise the four *dhyānas* and enjoy their fruits.
(iv) All Arhats attain *Nirvāṇa.*

Re. Puthujjana:

An average being does not fully eradicate from his mind attachment (*rāga*) and hatred (*doṣa*) but he may die with a good state of mind.

Re. Meditation:

(i) In the state of *samāhita,* one cannot utter words.
(ii) An Arhat cannot die while in the highest *samādhī* (*saññāvedayitanirodha*).

Re. Antarābhava:

There is no intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*) in the *Kāma* and *Rūpa dhātus.*

Re. Pudgala:

(i) Pudgala does not exist in the highest sense.
(ii) There is nothing which can transmigrate from one world to another.

Re. Anuśayas and Paryavasthānas:

Anuśayas (dormant passions) and *Paryavasthānas* (*pariyuṭṭhāna* in Pali = pervading passions) are *caitasika* (mental states), *citta-samprayukta* (associated with mind), and become objects of thought (*na anārammaṇa*).

Re. Vijñānas:

The five *vijñānas* conduce to attachment to the things of the world as also to detachment from the same.

Re. Asaṃskṛtas:

There are three *asaṃskṛtas* (unconstituted, viz., *prati-saṃkhyā-nirodha, apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha* and *ākāśa*) and not nine (see above).

Re. Brahmacarya of gods:

The gods except the *Asaññisattas* may practise *magga-bhāvanā* though they may not have ordination according to the Vinaya rules.

Re. Anupubbābhisamaya:

(i) The adepts realise the truths gradually.
(ii) They get rid of *kleśas* (impurities) also gradually.
(iii) They may, only in exceptional cases, realise the four *sāmaññaphalas* including *vimutti* all at once.

Re. Laukika and Lokottara:

All the practices and fruits after *srota-āpattiphala* are supra-mundane (*lokottara*) and not wordly (*laukika*).

CHAPTER XII

Place of Laity in Early Buddhism

The principles of early Buddhism did not make any special provision for the laity.[1] Its mission was to persuade householders to embrace the life of a recluse,[2] and Buddha was so successful in his mission in Magadha that people of the country raised a hue and cry over it, saying that Samaṇa Gotama was bent upon making the families sonless, women widowed and line of succession discontinued.[3] Many householders retired from the worldly life because of the teaching that the life of a householder was impure and an obstruction to spiritual progress while that of a recluse was pure, open and free, and besides it was not easy for a person living a householder's life to follow the teachings propounded by the teacher and to lead the thoroughly pure life of a *brahmacārī*.[4] Thus, it is evident that

1 See "*Early Buddhism and Laity*" in *Studies in Indian History and Culture* by Dr. N. N. Law. See above pp. 89, 97 for stray references to the laity.

2 *Vinaya*, i. p. 37: caratha brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāyā ti.

3 *Vinaya*, i, p. 37: aputtakāya paṭipanno samaṇo Gotamo, vedhavāya paṭipanno samaṇo Gotamo, kulūpacchedāya paṭipanno samaṇo Gotamo.

4 Cf. *Majjhima*, i. p. 344: Sambādho gharāvāso rajāpatho abbhokāso pabbajjā, nayidaṃ sukaram agāram ajjhāvasatā ekantaparipuṇṇam ekantaparisuddhaṃ saṅkhalikhitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritum, Cf. *Majjhima*, ii, p. 55: Yathā yathā khvāhaṃ Bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānami nayidaṃ sukaraṃ gharam ajjhāvasatā etc. as above.

the new religion was primarily meant for those who would retire from the household life. For householders generally some rites or ceremonies are provided, or some form of worship is recommended, by the founder of a religion but there was nothing of the kind in Buddhism. On the other hand the householders were asked to eschew rites and ceremonies (*sīlabbata*)[1] and this was made one of the primary conditions for becoming a devotee of Buddha.

At the same time, it has to be admitted that the Buddhist Saṅgha must have a lay-community for its very existence, some supporting families from which the members could have the bare necessaries of their life. In ancient India, however, the formation of a lay-community need not be a condition precedent to the formation and growth of a body of recluses. Without any distinction of caste and creed, the householders welcomed every ascetic approaching them for food and dress, and hence the Buddhist monks at first did not experience any difficulty to get their requirements from the existing families. As time went on, they picked up some householders who showed them more veneration and who were more prompt in making offerings to them than others. These householders were designated *upāsakas* or *upāsikās* and received special attention of the Buddhist monks. In the early days of Buddhism, these householders looked after the needs of the monks during the rainy-season retreats (*vassā-vāsa*) and got opportunities to come into frequent contact with them and to listen to their discourses. Such closer contacts led to the institution of certain rites and ceremonies which Buddhism wanted so much to avoid

1 Sans. *Śīla* and *Vrata*.

at its inception. The rites and ceremonies observed by these householders were as follows:—

(i) To utter the formula of *Trisaraṇa*,

(ii) To listen to religious discourses on *uposatha* days,

(iii) To observe eight *sīlas* occasionally, and

(iv) To offer robes to the monks on certain occasions, specially at the end of the rainy season retreat.

Later on, the faithful persons were advised,

(v) to visit the four places of pilgrimage,[1] and,

(vi) to worship the *stūpas*, particularly those containing the relics of Buddha.[2]

The six rites mentioned above, it should be noted, came into vogue gradually. We are told that Tapussa and Bhallika were the first to become *upāsakas* (*dvevācika*)[3] while Yasa's father became the third upāsaka with Trisaraṇa (*tevācika*).[4] Henceforward several Khattiyas, Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis[5] became upāsakas by uttering these words:—

"Abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama, abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama, Seyyathā pi bho Gotama nikujjitaṃ vā ukkujjeyya, paṭicchannaṃ vā vivareyya, mūḷhassa va maggaṃ ācikkheyya, andhakāre va telapajjotaṃ dhāreyya: cakkhumanto rūpāni dakkhintīti; evam evaṃ bhotā Gotamena anekapariyāyena dhammo pakāsito. Ete mayaṃ bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāma dhammañ ca bhikkhusaṅghañ ca upāsake no bhavaṃ Gotamo dhāretu ajjatagge pāṇupete saraṇagate ti."

1 *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, p. 141.

2 *Ibid*., p. 142.

3 *Vinaya*, i. p. 4. i.e. they took refuge in Buddha and Dhamma only, as the Saṅgha had not yet been formed.

4 *Ibid*. p. 17.

5 See *infra*, pp. 210-213.

(Excellent O Gotama, excellent. Just as one who turns the upturned, opens the covered ones, shows the path to the deluded, holds a lighted lamp in darkness, you have preached the doctrine in such a way that those who possess eyes (of knowledge) can see the actual objects. We seek refuge in you, O Gotama, in your Dhamma and in your Saṅgha. Accept us as your life-long lay-devotees).

The extract cited above appears *verbatim* at the end of almost every discourse addressed to a householder or a group of householders. It should not however be taken as indicative of a person's actually changing his creed and becoming an upāsaka. Several brāhmaṇas and gahapatis expressed their appreciation of the discourses by these set words, and did not care to follow up the declaration by observing the moral precepts and performing the duties specially prescribed for the Upāsakas and Upāsikās.

The Three Parisās

This class of devout listeners to Buddha's discourses is referred to in the Nikāyas as Khattiya parisā, Brāhmaṇa-parisā and Gahapatiparisā.[1] There are occasional references to the four castes[2] as well but the more common way of referring to this class of people was by the above-mentioned three *parisās* (assemblies).[3] In some passages the word '*parisā*' is replaced by

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 72: Abhijānāmi kho panāhaṃ Sāriputta, anekasataṃ khattiya-parisaṃ upasaṅkamitā, tatra pi mayā sannisinnapubbañ c'eva sallapitapubbañ ca sākacchā ca samapajjitapubbā.

2 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 259: Sabbe khattiyā aṭṭhaṅgasamannāgataṃ uposatham upavaseyyuṃ sabbe pi brāhmaṇā...sabbe pi vessā...sabbe pi suddā aṭṭhaṅgasamannāgataṃ uposatham upavaseyyum.

3 The other parisās are Samaṇa-parisā, Cātummahārājika-parisā,

'mahāsāla' (nobles or rich men)[1] Not unoften is the word 'paṇḍitā' (wise men) used instead of '*parisā*'.[2] The juxtaposition of the word 'gahapati' to 'khattiya' and 'brāhmaṇa' suggests that it meant usually the *seṭṭhis* (bankers) or businessmen or men who have taken to some vocations, such as agriculture, carpentry, smithy and so forth.[3]

In the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*[4] the distinctive features of the three *parisās* are pointed out thus: All the three classes of men seek wordly enjoyment (*bhogādhippāya*) and try to acquire knowledge (*paññupavicāra*). The Khattiyas rely on their prowess (*balādhiṭṭhānā*), is bent upon acquiring lands (*paṭhavībhinivesā*) and aim at dominance (*issariyapariyosanā*), the Brāhmaṇas depend on hymns and chants (*mantādhiṭṭhānā*), is attached to sacrifices (*yaññābhinivesā*) and aim at reaching Brahmaloka, while the Gahapatis depend on arts and crafts (*sippādhiṭṭhānā*), remains engaged with their works (*kammantābhinivesā*) and aim at fruition of their works (*niṭṭhita kammantapariyosanā*).

Aims and objects of Gahapatis

Of these three parisās, the largest number of devotees of Buddha came from the Gahapati parisā, few from Brāhmaṇa and

Tāvatiṃsa-p., Māra-p., Brahma-p. See *Majjhima*, i, p. 72; *Dīgha*, ii, p. 109; *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 51.

1 *Saṃyutta*, i, p. 71: Khattiyamahāsālā and Brāhmaṇa-mahāsālā have ample gold and silver and other treasures. *Aṅguttara*, iv, pp. 104, 130, 239; *Dīgha*, iii p. 146

2 Khattiya-paṇḍitā etc. *Saṃyutta*, iii, p. 6; *Majjhima*, i, p. 176; *Aṅguttara*, iv, pp. 104, 130, 239.

3 Cf. Kassakagahapati in *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 229.

4 *Aṅguttara*, iii, p. 363.

a very few from the Khattiya. About the characteristics of the Gahapatis, the Nikāyas say that they were keen about accumulation of gold, crops, buildings, lands, wife, male and female servants.[1] Their happiness consisted in possessing worldly objects, in enjoyment of the same, and in remaining free from debts and faults.[2] In short, the Gahapatis enjoyed all worldly pleasures derivable through the five organs of sense.[3] Dīghajānu Koliyaputta said that the householders sought worldly objects, sons and wife, unguents, garlands and other articles of luxury, gold and silver; he wanted instructions from the Teacher as to the ways and means by which the householders could be happy in this life and the next. The reply was that the householders should be energetic in his vocation (*uṭṭhānasampadā*), take good care of the wealth earned righteously by the sweat of his brow (*ārakkhasampadā*), associate with men having faith, good morals, charitable disposition and wisdom (*kalyāṇamittatā*), and try to acquire their good qualities[4] and be like them (*samajīvitā*). Tapussa gahapati[5] was frank enough to admit that the gahapatis were afraid of retirement, and given to worldly pleasures because they had not realised the evil consequences of attachment to worldly objects. Potaliya gahapati[6] thought that as he had retired from his works (*kammanta*) and business (*vohāra*), leaving his possessions to his sons, and as he had been living on bare requirements of food and dress, he

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 452.

2 *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 69: atthisukha, bhogasukha, anaṇasukha and anavajja-sukha.

3 *Majjhima*, i. p. 505.

4 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 281-2; iii, p. 45.

5 *Aṅguttara*, iv. p. 438.

6 *Majjhima*, ii, p. 359

should not be called a *gahapati;* but Buddha would not listen to him as he had not yet fulfilled the elementary conditions of a retired life. Though the householders remained engrossed in their wordly possessions, some of them were religious minded and approached different religious teachers for instructions. The Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis of the village Sālā[1] said that they had listened to the teachings of different teachers and had not yet made up their mind to accept any of them as their spiritual guide. They approached Buddha and his disciples and listened to their instructions now and then, and some of them avowed themselves as upāsakas of Buddha, but not necessarily complying with all the conditions to be fulfilled by an upāsaka.

Discourses to Gahapatis

In every Nikāya, excepting the *Dīgha,* there is a *Gahapativagga,*[2] in which Buddha administered instructions to a particular *gahapati* or delivered discourses for the benefit of *gahapatis* in general. There are also discourses dealing incidentally with the general rules of morality, effects of *karma,* ideals of a householder and his wife, and the fundamental principles of Buddhism. The Gahapativaggas are found to contain discussions on all aspects of Buddhist ethics and philosophy. There were also many learned Brāhmaṇas, Khattiyas and Gahapatis who took part in abstruse discussions with Buddha and his disciples. In the *Gahapativagga* of the *Majjhima Nikāya,*[3] there are ten suttas. In the Kandarakasutta, Pessa

1 *Majjhima,* i, p. 401.

2 *Majjhima,* i, pp. 339-413; *Saṃyutta,* ii, pp. 68-80; iv, pp. 109-124; *Aṅguttara,* iv, pp. 208-235.

3 *Majjhima,* i, pp. 339-413.

Hatthārohaputta spoke in appreciation of the four *satipaṭṭhānas* and said that he and other householders occasionally tried these four practices.[1] He was then told about the various ascetic practices prevalent in the country, and the superiority of the practices and acquisitions of Buddhist monks. To Dasama Gahapati was explained how a monk attained the *anāgāmi* and *arahatta* stages, and practised the four *brahmavihāras* and *arūpasamāpattis*.[2] The Sakkas of Kapilavatthu, specially Mahānāma, listened to a discourse on what made a *sekha* (i.e. a monk progressing towards Nibbāna). Potaliya gahapati felt offended at being called a *gahapati* in his so-called retired life and he was made to understand how one ceased to be a householder according to Buddha's law (*ariyassa vinaye*). Jīvaka could not believe that Buddha was taking meat specially prepared for him and on enquiry he was told how could the Buddha, perfect in the four *brahmavihāras*, do so. In the Upālisutta, one of the longest discourses, the teachings of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta were discussed, and Upāli gahapati, a distinguished disciple of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta, was convinced of the superiority of Buddhist teachings, and was won over to the Buddhist faith. Puṇṇa Koliyaputta and Acela Seniya listened to a discourse on the effects of *kamma*,[3] gave up their austerities and joined the Buddhist order. Abhayarājakumāra, a lay disciple of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta, wanted to cross words with Buddha at the instigation of his teacher but ultimately succumbed to Buddha's arguments. Pañcakaṅga thapati would not recongnise the *adukkhamasukha-*

1 *Majjhima*, p. 340: Mayam pi hi bhante gihī odātavasanā kālena kālaṃ imesu catusu satipaṭṭhānesu supatiṭṭhitacittā viharāma.

2 *Ibid.*, i, pp. 350-353.

3 *Ibid.*, i, p. 389.

vedanā as the third *vedanā*, the two other being *sukha* and *dukkha*. Buddha explained that *sukha* was a relative term and then gave an exposition of the stages of *sukha* through which a monk passed in order to reach the highest state of mental concentration. In the last sutta of this *Gahapativagga* is given an exposition of the views of a few heretical teachers as well as the wrong views held about *Arūpa-brahmaloka* and *Nibbāna;* at the end of this discourse all the Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis of the village Sālā expressed their desire to become devotees of Buddha.[1]

There are two *Gahapativaggas* in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*.[2] In the first, the Gahapatis were admonished to observe the five moral precepts, develop faith in the *Triratna*, and comprehend the law of causation including the four truths. Incidentally the question of the identity and difference of soul and *khandhas* is discussed. In the second *Gahapativagga*, there are discourses on hindrances (*saṃyojanas*) which kept one away from *Nibbāna*, on watchfulness over body (*kāya satipaṭṭhāna*) and its movements, on restraint in act, speech and thought, and on feelings of pain and pleasure derived through the organs of sense. There is a reference to the fall of Brāhmaṇas from their ancient ideal which was similar to the Buddhist ideal of self-restraint.

As regards the duties of a gahapati it is stated in this Nikāya that a gahapati should (i) maintain his parents; (ii) rever elders of the family, (iii) use gentle words; (iv) avoid malicious talks; (v) discard miserliness; (vi) be open-handed; (vii) be truthful and (viii) never be angry.

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 413.

2 *Saṃyuttta*, ii, pp. 68-80; iv, pp. 109-124.

In the *Gahapativagga* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*,[1] the duties of a gahapati are dealt with more than the general principles of Buddhism. The eight special virtues of a gahapati are given as follows:—(i) firm faith in Buddha; (ii) appreciation of the Dhamma; (iii) regard for the Saṅgha; (iv) charitableness even to the extent of giving away one's wife, (v) open-handedness in distributing property among the saints; (vi) keenness to listen to religious discourses, (vii) lack of pride due to spiritual success; and (viii) removal of the five impurities (*orambhāgiyas*). The gahapatis are expected to possess seven other virtues, viz., faith (*saddhā*), moral restraint (*sīla*), modesty (*hiri*), shame (*ottappa*),[2] learning (*bahussuta*), charitable disposition (*cāga*) and knowledge (*paññā*). Some of the gahapatis practised the four *saṃgaha-vatthus*[3] viz., gift, sweet words, beneficial acts and treatment of others as his equals, and thereby obtained a large circle of friends.[4] Hatthaka of Alavi was the chief of those who practised the *saṃgaha-vatthus*.[5]

Though there is no Gahapativagga in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, there are two suttas (*Lakkhaṇa* and *Sigālovāda*) which deal with the duties of a gahapati. In the *Lakkhaṇa-sutta*, the virtues or duties of a gahapati are mentioned though not in a systematic form, e.g., a good man should perform good deeds, restrain himself in body, speech and thought, be charitable, observe *uposathas*, take care of parents, Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas,[6] practise the four *saṃgahavatthus*,[7] exert for others' good, both moral

1 *Aṅguttara*, iv, pp. 208-235. 2 Cf. *Saṃyutta*, ii, p. 197.

3 Dāna, peyyavāca, atthacariyā and samānattatā.

4 The last four discourses in this Vagga have nothing to do with the duties of Gahapatis and so they are passed over here.

5 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 26. 6 *Dīgha*, iii, p. 145. 7 *Ibid.*, p. 152.

and secular,[1] approach Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas for instructions,[2] never harbour any anger or hatred,[3] try to bring about concord among quarrelsome persons[4] and help others in increasing their faith, moral virtues, knowledge, charity, religiosity, wisdom, and secular possessions, look upon others with friendly eyes, never utter an untrue, malicious, harsh or useless word, or never cheat others, and so forth.

In the *Sigālovādasutta*, the following duties are prescribed for a gahapati:—(i) abstinence from killing, speaking falsehood, stealing and adultery; (ii) avoiding commission of offences through strong will (*chanda*), hatred (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*) and fear (*bhaya*); (iii) refraining from drinking and merry-making, evening shows, dramatic performances, dice-plays, evil friends and idleness; (iv) avoidance of enemies posing as friends and obtaining sincere friends; (v) looking after parents, teachers, sons and wife, friends and advisers, servants and workers, Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas.[5]

Gahapatānī

There are not many discourses specially devoted to the duties of the female members of a household. In the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*[6] a woman is enjoined to earn merits by good deeds, so that she may be reborn in a good family, be married in a good family, have no co-wife, be blessed with sons, and possess influence over her husband. Her strength, it is said, consisted in her appearance (*rūpa*), wealth (*bhoga*), relatives (*ñāti*), sons (*putta*) and moral virtues (*sīla*).[7] Like the gahapatis, they should also develop faith

1 *Dīgha*, III, p. 154.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 157.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 159.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 160.
5 Cf. *Saṃyutta*, i, p. 231.
6 *Ibid.*, iv, p. 249-250.
7 *Ibid.*, iv, p. 246.

(*saddhā*), observe moral precepts (*sīla*), listen to religious discourses (*suta*), be charitable (*cāga*) and acquire knowledge (*paññā*).[1] They should be quiet, gentle and obedient.[2]

Women[3] generally are more miserly (*macchariyā*), envious (*issukī*), more strongly attached to worldly objects[4] than men, their knowledge also is less than that of men.[5] They must drive away from their minds anger, hatred and disrespect for others,[6] and be chaste, diligent, modest and bashful. They must not be greedy, wish others' evil, indulge in malicious, harsh or useless talks, and discard wrong views.[7]

There are certain special directions given to women, which are as follows:—

They should (i) be well-wisher of their husbands, cater to their comforts and be sweet and attractive to them, (ii) respect the parents of the husband, and rever the Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas revered by the husband's family, (iii) be efficient in household work, e.g., in spinning, (iv) look after the needs of the servants and workers of the household and feed them properly, (v) protect paddy, gold and other articles brought by her husband, (vi) become an upāsikā by taking Trisaraṇa, (vii) observe the five precepts, and (viii) be charitable and (ix) acquire knowledge.[8] The first five bring her success in this life and the succeeding four (i.e. *saddhā, sīla, suta* and *paññā*) make her happy in the next.

1 *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 250; *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 270.

2 *Majjhima*, i, p. 125.

3 *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 240.

4 *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 240. It is said that for these deficiencies they were not allowed to sit in the assemblies.

5 *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 203: *Kopa, dosa* and *appaccaya*. See also *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 240 f.

6 *Aṅguttara*, v, p. 286.

7 *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 246.

8 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 265-266; iii, p. 37.

The conversation that Nakulamātā gahapatānī had with her husband in deathbed shows how spiritually advanced sometimes the gahapatānīs were. Nakulamātā said to her husband that (i) death with anxiety is disapproved by Buddha and so he should not die with any anxiety (*sāpekho*) for her as to how she would meet both ends and rear her sons; she knew spinning and shaving hair (*veniṃ olikhituṃ*) and by plying that trade,[1] she would be able to tide over her difficulties. (ii) He need not apprehend that she would go to another family, for both of them knew that they had been living as *brahmacārīs* for the last 16 years. (iii) He must not think that she would not care to approach Bhagavān or his monks after his death; on the other hand, she would be more eager to approach them, or (iv) that she would not observe the moral precepts; on the contrary she would be no less energetic than the best of the householder-disciples of Buddha. (v) He must not have any doubt that she would not attain mental tranquillity (*cetosamatha*); on the contrary she would be the best of those upāsikās who practised *ceto-samatha*. (vi) He must rest assured that she was deeply interested in this doctrine and was not wanting in deep faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha.[2]

There were other upāsikās also like Sujātā, Visākhā, Khujjuttarā, Sāmāvatī, Uttarā Nandamātā, Suppavāsā Koliyadhītā, Suppiyā Kātiyānī, and Kālī of Kuraraghara, who were extolled by Buddha as leading female devotees for having some extraordinary virtues.[3] In spiritual attainments, the female lay-devotees vied equally well with the male-devotees.[4]

1 It seems that Nakulapitā was a barber by profession.

2 *Aṅguttara*, ii, pp. 295.

3 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 26.

4 See *Infra*, 233 f.

Upāsakas and Upāsikās

The Gahapatis mentioned above were more or less devout listeners to the moral or religious discourses delivered by the monks. They offered food, clothing and other necessaries of life to the monks. Occasionally at the end of a discourse, they signified their appreciation by saying that they would take Trisaraṇa and become upāsakas till the end of their lives. A number of Brāhmaṇas, Gahapatis, Gāmaṇīs, Paribbājakas, nobles and princes[1] are found to say that they would become upāsakas, but there is nothing to show that they actually followed the moral code and performed the duties prescribed for the Upāsakas. These may be taken as lay-supporters of the Buddhist Saṅgha. The fact that there was a large number of such supporters is evidenced by the remark in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* that Buddha should choose for his *parinibbāna* one of the towns like Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, Sāketa, Kosambī, and Vārāṇasī where are many Khattiya, Brāhmaṇa and Gahapati *mahāsālas* to worship his relics.

Out of this body of lay-supporters appeared a group of persons who were more earnest in their devotion to Buddhism, and naturally tried to follow the principles of Buddhism as far as compatible with their life as a householder. In order to distinguish this body, Mahānāma the Sākyan raised the question as

1 E. g. Caṅki brāhmaṇa (M. ii. 177); Ghoṭamukha-br. (M. ii. 163); Assalāyana-br. (M. ii. 157); Brahmāyu-br. (M. ii. 145); Citta-Gahapati (S. iv. 301); (for other Gahapatis, see above); Vekhanassa paribbājaka (M. ii.); Susima-paribbājaka (S. ii. 120); Madhuro Avantiputta (M. ii. 90); Bodhirājakumāra (M. ii. 97), For Gāmaṇis, see Gāmaṇi-Saṃyutta in *Saṃyutta-Nikāya*, iv.

to what should be the marks of an upāsaka.[1] Buddha's answer, however, was not very helpful for he simply said that anyone taking the Trisaraṇa was an upāsaka. In another context, however, it is stated that an upāsaka must have not only faith in the Triratna, observe moral precepts, and do good to people in return but also not resort to auspicious rites, and offer gifts to persons outside the Buddhist Saṅgha.[2] There are instances to show that some householders eschewed their old teacher and became an upāsaka of Buddha. Pukkusa Mallaputta, a disciple of Ālāra Kālāma,[3] Upāli Gahapati and Abhaya Rājakumāra, a rich upāsaka of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta,[4] a gahapati-devotee of an Ājīvaka[5] changed their teachers and became upāsakas of Buddha. There are evidences to show that a number of householders was distinguished as devout upāsakas, and that their number was large in certain localities.[6] The stereo-typed remark found in the *Nikāyas* that Buddhist upāsakas do not like noisy discussions shows that some householders were distinguished as Buddhist upāsakas. Then passages like "*yavatā kho pana samaṇassa Gotamassa sāvakā gihī odātavasanā Sāvatthiyaṃ paṭivasanti, ayaṃ tesaṃ aññataro Pañcakaṅgo thapati*" (Pañcakaṅgo the architect is one of the distinguished white-dressed householder disciples of Gotama residing at Sāvatthī)[7] leave no room for doubt that some persons were marked out as Buddhist upāsakas.

1 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 220; *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 395: Kittavatā nu kho bhante upāsako ti ti?

2 *Dīgha*, ii, p. 132-3.

3 *Majjhima*, i, p. 379.

4 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 219.

5 Cf. *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 59: Campeyyakā upāsakā approached Sāriputta for requesting Buddha to deliver a discourse to them.

6 *Majjhima*, ii, p. 23.

7 *Ibid.*

The members of these families received the special attention of the Buddhist monks, who, prescribed for them certain moral duties, which were classified under five heads, viz., *Saddhā* (faith), *Sīla* (observance of moral precepts), *Cāga* (charity), *Suta* (listening to religious discourses) and *Paññā* (comprehending the higher truths).[1]

(i) By *Saddhā* is meant that an upāsaka must have firm faith in the Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha. There is a set formulae to express that faith, which is, in short, as follows:—Bhagavā the perfectly enlightened endowed with knowledge and good conduct is the highest, the knower of the world, the leader of men and gods. His Dharma is well-preached, produces fruit in this life, knows no limitation of time and is realisable within one's ownself. The Saṅgha of his disciples, who are in one of the eight stages of sanctification, is well-established in good conduct, is bent upon acquiring knowledge, is worthy of gifts, praise and reverence and is a fit recipient of gifts.

(ii) By *Sīla* is meant that an upāsaka must abstain from killing, stealing, adultery, speaking falsehood and indulging in drinks and merrymakings.[2] He must discard all mental impurities like excessive greed (*abhijjhā*), hatred (*vyāpāda*), slothfulness (*thīnamiddha*), flurry, (*uddhaccakukkucca*), and doubt (*vicikicchā*).

(iii) By *Cāga* is meant that an upāsaka should be charitable, provide the monks with food, robes, beds and medicinal re-

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 467; iii, p. 99; *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 250; *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 210; iv, p. 270.

2 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 220.

quisites.[1] He should be open-handed, prone to giving gifts[2] to the needy.

(iv) By *Suta* is meant that an upāsaka should reverentially listen to religious discourses and moral teachings imparted by the monks.

(v) By *Paññā* is meant that an upāsaka should try to comprehend the origin and decay of worldly objects,[3] in other words, realise the four truths and the law of causation.[4]

The above mentioned five practices are fully described in the *Gahapativagga*[5] and elsewhere. Ugga Gahapati said that his *saddhā* was of such an order that the moment he saw Buddha even from a distance, his mind obtained satisfaction (*pasidi*). He observed the five *sikkhāpadas*, and thereby completed the practice of *sīlas*. He approached bhikkhus and listened to their discourses with due respect (*sakkaccam eva suṇāmi no asakkaccaṃ*). For the sake of sacrifice (*cāga*) he would give away his young wives and divide his property among the religious people, and while giving gifts to the monks he would not discriminate between one monk and another on account of their spiritual attainments. He would listen to the higher teachings of Buddhism and thereby become *paññavā*.

To Brāhmaṇa gahapatis of Veludvāra, Buddha delivered a

1 Cf. *Aṅguttara*, ii, 65.

2 *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 65; Muttacāgā payatapāni vossaggaratā yācayogā dānasaṃvibhāgaratā.

3 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 271: Udayatthagāminiyā paññāya samannāgato ariyāya nibbedhikāya sammādukkhakkhayagāminiyā.

4 *Aṅguttara*, v, p. 184; *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 61; *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 67. For Nīvaraṇas, see *Saṃyutta*, v, pp. 60, 146.

5 *Aṅguttara*, iv, pp. 209 ff.

discourse dilating on the five precepts referred to above. He said that an upāsaka in order to become a *sotāpanna* should bear in mind the following *dhammas*:—

(i) Realising how painful is one's own death, a person should not cause other's death.

(ii) Remembering how a thief is hated by one whose possessions are stolen, a person must not steal other's property.

(iii) Knowing how much a person is hated by the man with whose wife he commits adultery, one must not commit adultery.

(iv) As a liar is disliked by everybody so one must not speak a lie.

(v) As a man who by malicious words brings about dissension is abhorred by everybody, so one should not utter malicious words.

(vi) As a person is disliked for harsh words, so one must avoid uttering the same.

(vii) As a person is looked down for his frivolous talks, one must not indulge in the same.[1]

A person should not only practise the seven dhammas mentioned above for his own benefit but also persuade others to do the same.[2]

An upāsaka is further prohibited from trading in (i) weapons; (ii) livestock; (iii) meat; (iv) wine and (v) poison.[3]

In the *Milindapañha*[4] there are a few additional instructions given to the upāsakas. These are as follows:—

An upāsaka should (i) feel happy or sad at the joy or

1 *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 353.

2 Cf. *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 221.

3 *Ibid.*, i, p. 208.

4 *Milindapañha*, p. 94.

grief of the Saṅgha; (ii) make the *dhamma* the leading factor of his life; (iii) share his gain with others as far as possible; (iv) exert his best for the growth of the religion of the teacher whenever its decline is noticed; (v) hold the right view; (vi) avoid performing any auspicious rite or venerating another teacher even for the sake of his life; (vii) observe restraint in acts and words; (viii) be keen in maintaining concord; (ix) discard jealousy and (x) avoid hypocrisy in following the religion.

In the *Vinaya*[1] are enumerated the gains obtained by a householder by observing the sīlas, *viz.*, (i) wealth and property; (ii) fame; (iii) boldness in any social congregation; (iv) death with consciousness up to the last moment; and lastly (v) heavenly existence.

Lay-devotees and Monks

Apart from the moral precepts to be observed by the upāsakas and upāsikās, they were enjoined to supply the members of the Saṅgha with robe, food, bed and medicinal requisites.[2] As a result of such gifts they were given the hope that in the next world they would have long life, good appearance, happiness and strength.[3] In making these gifts, however, they must not have any selfish end in view (*sāpekha*).[4] Some of the upāsakas and upāsikās visited the several ārāmas to find out if any one was sick and needed medicines which they procured to the best of their abilities.[5] The monks on the other hand were warned that with complete self-restraint they should approach householders for food and robe, or for any other purpose. They

1 *Vinaya*, i, p. 227-228.
2 *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 66.
3 *Ibid.*, ii, p. 64.
4 *Ibid.*, ii, p., 59.
5 *Vinaya*, i, p. 216.

were not to associate themselves with the joys and griefs of householders,[1] for there were instances of monks having got entangled with women[2] by such association. They were also advised not to accept alms from those householders who had at any time attempted to bring about evil plight to the monks, or injure them in any way, or oust them from their residence (*āvāsa*), or have abused them or tried to cause dissension between one monk and another, or have spoken ill of Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha.[3] The monks were further instructed to avoid those householders who would not welcome them with gentle words, or show respects to them, or offer them seats kindly, or conceal their possessions, give little and bad things though they have ample and good things, offer gifts irreverentially, not approach monks for listening to discourses, and dislike instructions.[4] At the end of the rainy season the Saṅgha held a ceremony called Pavāraṇā and Kaṭhina at every *āvāsa*. On these occassions, the upāsakas were advised to offer robes and were told that gifts on such occasions carried special merits.

Uposatha of the Upāsakas

On the uposatha days, the more devout upāsakas were advised to observe eight precepts instead of five. They sometimes spent a few days in a monastery in company of the monks. The eight precepts[5] were,—

1 *Saṃyutta*, iii, p. 11.

2 *Aṅguttara*, iii, p. 259; iv, p. 54.

3 *Ibid*., iv, p. 344.

4 *Ibid*., v, p. 387.

5 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 254:

Pāṇaṃ na haññe na cādinnam ādiye
musa na bhāse na ca majjapo siyā

(i) complete abstention from killing by laying aside all weapons, and developing a kindly and friendly feeling towards all beings;

(ii) complete abstention from stealing, and remaining pure and satisfied with what is given;

(iii) total abstention from sexual enjoyments, and living the life of a true *brahmacārī;*

(iv) total avoidance of untruth, and remaining always anxious to be truthful;

(v) refraining from all kinds of drinks and merry-makings;

(vi) taking only one meal a day, and refraining from afternoon meals;

(vii) keeping away from all places of amusement having dance and music, also non-use of scents, unguents and garlands and lastly;

(viii) sleeping on low beds or grass mats and discarding high beds.

Some of the advanced upāsakas were able to attain concentration of mind. This concentration was induced in them by their deep faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. This faith engendered in their minds deep satisfaction that they had achieved something good. Through this satisfaction, their mind

abrahmacariyā virameyya methunā
rattiṃ na bhuñjeyya vikālabhojanaṃ
mālaṃ na dhāraye na ca gandhaṃ ācare
mañce chamāyaṃ vasayetha santhate
etaṃ hi aṭṭhaṅgikaṃ āh' uposathaṃ
Buddhena dukkhantagunā pakāsitaṃ.

became serene and concentrated.[1] They practised the *jhānas* one after another and perfected themselves in all the four *jhānas*. Cittagahapati[2] and Uttarā Nandamātā[3] became highly proficient in the *jhānas*. Some of the upāsakas practised the four *brahmavihāras* and four *satipaṭṭhānas*.[4] Sirivaddha and Mānadinna were advised to practise *satipaṭṭhānas* in order to overcome acute pain due to disease.[5] Sāmāvatī upāsikā[6] was the chief of those female lay-devotees, who practised *mettā*. Khujjuttarā upāsikā acquired *paṭisambbidā*[7] and abilities in learning Buddha's words.[8] Nandamātā upāsikā was so spiritually advanced that her mind was not moved when she saw her husband reborn as an ogre. Her chastity was unimpeachable and there was no occasion for her to confess (*paṭidesitā*) any transgression of the moral laws. Nandamātā mastered the four *jhānas* and removed all the five *orambhāgiya* impurities.

Teaching imparted to lay-devotees

In delivering discourses to the householders, Buddha and his disciples uniformly observed an order (*anupubbikathaṃ*). They first expatiated on the merits of giving gifts (*dānakathaṃ*, and of observing moral precepts (*sīlakatham*), and of the reward

1 *Aṅguttara*, v, p. 330.
2 *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 281 f.
3 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 26; iv, p. 66.
4 See above, p. 214.
5 *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 176.
6 *Aṅguttara*, i, p. 26.
7 *Visuddhimagga*, p. 442.
8 It is said that she could recite the *Itivuttaka* heard by her from the teacher.

obtained thereby, viz., a heavenly existence (*saggakathaṃ*). Then they dilated on the evils of enjoying worldly pleasures (*kāmānaṃ ādīnavaṃ*) and the merit of retirement from the world (*nekkhamme ānisaṃsaṃ*). When they found that the teaching had made a good impression on the mind of a householder, they passed on to the next higher teaching, the exposition of the four truths, *dukkha, samudaya, nirodha* and *magga,* and made them realise that whatever has origin must have decay (*yaṃ kiñci samudayadhammamaṃ sabban taṃ nirodhadhamman ti*).[1]

There is a rule in the *Pātimokkha* (*Pācittiya* no. 4) that to an uninitiated the *dhamma* is not to be preached syllable by syllable. The upāsakas were advised to avoid reading Suttantas.[2] It is however clear that the householders were as far as possible kept away from the deeper teachings, lest they should be frightened away from taking interest in the religion. But again, we find Nandamātā upāsikā reciting the *Pārāyaṇa* at dawn[3] and Sāriputta explaining to Hāliddikāni gahapati the verses of the Aṭṭhakavagga.[4]

There were however lay-devotees, who took interest in the deepest problems of Buddhist philosophy. Cittagahapati was complimented for being able to understand the subtleties of Buddhist philosophy[5] while Anāthapiṇḍika was told that topics

1 The first discourse was delivered by Buddha to the Brāhmaṇa gahapatis of Magadha. See *Vinaya*, i, p. 37. Cf. *Majjhima*, i, p. 379; ii, p. 145.

2 *Saṃyutta*, v, p. 407.

3 *Aṅguttara*, iv, p. 63.

4 *Sutta Nipāta*, p. 165.

5 *Saṃyutta*, iv, pp. 282 f.: Suladdhaṃ te gahapati yassa te gambhīre buddhavacane paññācakkhu kamati ti.

not to be explained to a householder were being laid before him for his edification.[1]

When Anāthapiṇḍika was in his deathbed, Sārīputta delivered to him a discourse on Buddhist philosophy so that he might overcome the extreme pain.[2] In the discourse he pointed out that a person must not cling to the six organs of sense, or to the perceptions and feelings derived through the organs of sense, or to the *dhātus* like earth, water, fire, air, space (*ākāsa*) and consciousness (*viññaṇa*), or to the five constituents of a being, or to the four Arūpadhātus, or to this world or the next, or to things seen, heard, thought or known. Buddha explained to Nakulapitā how the unenlightened persons identified soul with one or all of the *khandhas* and thus suffered from the misconception of the existence of a self. Mahākaccāna explained to Hāliddikāni the following stanza of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*:—

"Okaṃ pahāya aniketasārī
gāme akubbaṃ muni santhavāni
kāmehi ritto apurekkharāno
kathaṃ na viggayha janena kayirā."

[A monk should give up clinging to the five constituents, remain unattached to the characteristics of the perceived objects (*aniketasārī*). He must not associate himself with the weal and woe of householders, discard love, desire, attachment and despair, not speculate about his future existence (*apurekkharāno*) and never quarrel with other monks regarding correctness and incorrectness of a *dhamma* or a rule of discipline.]

In all the discourses delivered to Citta, Nakulapitā and

1 *Majjhima*, iii, p. 261: Na kho gahapati gihīnam odātavasanānaṃ evarūpī dhammakathā paṭibhāti.

2 *Majjhima*, iv, p. 258 f. Cf. *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 115 f.

Hāliddikāni, the main topic dealt with was that a person must not take pleasure in the origin of *khandhas,* which were subject to decay; that an unwise person misconceived one or all of the *khandhas* as soul, and developed a notion of I-ness. A true disciple of Buddha should not care for his past *khandhas,* nor think of his future *khandhas* and must not have any attachment to his present *khandhas.*[1] Ugga gahapati and others were taught that those who were engrossed with the sense-objects would not attain Nibbāna.[2] Soṇa gahapati[3] was taught that the *khandhas* were impermanent and impermanence was grief, and that none of the *khandhas* or all the *khandhas* taken together was soul. In the *Citta-saṃyutta,*[4] we have practically all the abstruse discussions on Buddhist philosophy. These are as follows:—

(i) Neither the organs of sense nor their objects are worldly ties—the tie is thirst that arises out of the contact of the two.

(ii) The distinction that lies between the organ of sense, its object, and the perception caused by the contact of the two.

(iii) The sixty-two non-Buddhistic doctrines are nothing but the outcome of the misapprehension of one or all of the *khandhas* as soul.

(iv) The exact implications of *saṅkhārā* in *Kāya- Vacī* and *Citta-saṅkhārā,*

(v) The method by which a meditator induces and discontinues the meditation in which perception and consciousness become inactive (*saññāvedayitanirodha*),

1 *Saṃyutta,* iii, pp. 1 f.
2 *Ibid.,* iv, p. 109.
3 *Ibid.,* iii, p. 48.
4 *Ibid.,* iv, pp. 281 f

and the distinction between death and *saññāvedayitanirodha*.

(vi) The meaning of mental emancipation (*ceto-vimutti*) through realisation of the absence of desire (*akiñcañña*), of substancelessness (*suññatā*), and characteristiclessness (*animittatā*) of worldly objects.

(vii) Exposition of the four *brahmavihāras* viz., love, compassion, joy at other's success, and equanimity.

(viii) Elucidation of the four 'meditations: *savitakka-savicāra, avitakka-avicāra,* etc.

From the above, it will be observed that the advanced house holders tried to comprehend the deepest problems of Buddhist philosophy, and on occasions even entered into discussions with the teachers of other sects[1]. Though still in white robes they were as spiritually advanced as a monk.

Upāsaka's Spiritual Attainments

The goal that was held before the householders was rebirth in one of the heavens[1] or as Sakka, the king of gods. This conception was already existing in the pre-Buddhist days, and all religions which accepted the theory of *karma* endorsed it. A householder should be first instructed to make gifts and to observe the precepts, and he is to be convinced that as fruit of this he would be reborn in the heavens (*sagga*). The Nikāyas are full of instances of good householders, who by leading a virtuous life were reborn as gods, and then there is the whole of

1 Citta gahapati crossed words with Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta. See *Saṃyutta*, iv, p. 298 f.

2 *Majjhima*, i, p. 505: Householders enjoying worldly pleasures by good conduct goes to *sagga*.

the *Vimānavatthu* to illustrate this theory of *karma*. Aśoka also upheld this view, and did not like to go beyond. But the principles of Buddhism could not support it fully. Immediately after *saggakhatham*, the householders were to be instructed in looking upon worldly pleasures as evil and retirement as the best course of life (*nekkhamme ānisaṃsaṃ*). Hence it is evident that the ideal held by Buddhism even before the householders was not rebirth in one of the heavens but retirement from the worldly life. In the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, Buddha is heard to say about the fruits attained by some of his departed *upāsakas*. He said that Sudatta (=Anāthapiṇḍika) and ninety others had become Sakadāgāmi, while Sujātā and 500 others Sotāpanna. Kakudha upāsaka reached the Anāgāmi stage, so also did Kāliṅga, Nikaṭa, Katissabho, Tuṭṭha, Bhadda, Subhadda and several others.[1]

The next lower fruits attained by the upāsakas are detailed in the *Janavasabha Sutta*[2] where it is stated that those who take the *trisaraṇa* and observe the *sīlas* are reborn as Paranimmitavasavatti, Nimmāṇarati. Tusita, Yama, Tāvatiṃsa and Cātummahārājika[3] gods, and that the lowest state in which an upāsaka is reborn is that of Gandhabba. The merit of observing the uposatha with eight precepts is immense happiness surpassing even that of the kingship of all the sixteen provinces of India. He is reborn as one of the gods of the heavens mentioned above. A man or a woman who has observed the uposatha and earned the least merit will be reborn as a god.[4]

1 *Dīgha*, ii, pp. 92-93, 200-1.

2 *Ibid.*, ii, p. 212.

3 Cf. *Aṅguttara*, iv, pp. 252 f.

4 *Ibid.*, iv, p. 255: Tasmā hi nārī ca naro ca silavā aṭṭhaṅgupetam upavass'uposathaṃ puññāni katvāna sukhudrayāni aninditā saggam upenti ṭhānan ti.

It is evident therefore that the fruits earned by an upāsaka ranged from the *Anāgāmi* stage to rebirth as a *Gandhabba*. An advanced upāsaka naturally did not wish to have re-existence however happy it might be. Citta Gahapati when in deathbed was tempted by the gods to wish to have a future existence as a Cakkavatti, but he convinced them that the life of a Cakkavatti was impermanent and hence it was also not a desirable state.[1]

The upāsakas and upāsikās, though retaining their white dress, aspired for the fruits obtained by the monks and nuns, viz., Sotāpatti, Sakadāgāmi and Anāgāmi. Like the monks they had not the opportunity of following a particular way of life, but still they were held out the hope that by fulfilling the duties prescribed for them they could attain three of the four fruits attained by a monk or nun.

The first fruit attained by a monk is Sotāpatti. It could also be attained by an upāsaka or upāsikā by practising *saddhā, sīla, suta, cāga* and *paññā* explained above.[2] The condition precedent to the attainment of this fruit is the removal of three hindrances, viz., belief in the existence of a self (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*),[3] belief in the efficacy of rituals (*sīlabbataparāmāsa*) and lack of

1 *Saṃyutta*, iv, pp. 301-4.

2 Pp. 222-3; for details, see *Saṃyutta*, ii, p. 681 also *Saṃyutta*, v p,. 411. In addition to the above five-fold practices the lay-devotees were recommended to cultivate the following four habits: association with wise men, listening to religious discourses, proper mental exertion (*yoniso manasikara*) and observance of all major and minor rules of morality.

3 That the self is identical with one or all of the *khandhas*. See *Saṃyutta*, iv,. p. 287.

faith in the Triratna (*vicikicchā*). There are instances of several upāsakas and upāsikās who attained sotāpatti.

It is rather interesting to read of an instance of a lay-devotee addicted to drinking attaining the fruit of Sotāpatti. The reason shown is that he had so much faith in the *Triratna* that he could not be reborn in any of the lower planes of existence and was destined to *sambodhi*.[1]

The second fruit attained by a monk is Sakadāgāmi. The conditions precedent to the attainment of this stage was the reduction of attachment (*rāga*), hatred (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*) to the minmum (*tanutta*). A large number of lay-devotees complied with this condition and attained the Sakadāgāmi stage, i.e., they would come once more to this world, and then attain Nibbāna.

The third fruit attained by a monk is Anāgāmi. To attain this stage one must completely remove *rāga, dosa* and *moha*. The usual condition laid down for a lay-devotee is that he is to remove the five impurities of the lower category (*orambhāgīyas*) to attain this fruit. The five impurities are the three *saṃyojanas*, mentioned above viz., *sakkāyadiṭṭhi, sīlabbataparāmāsa* and *vicikicchā*, the other two being *kāmarāga* and *byāpāda* in other words, *rāga* and *dosa*. By reaching the Anāgāmi stage, the lay-devotee does not return to the world but is reborn only once in one of the heavens to attain Nibbāna (*tatthaparinibbāyī*).

The fourth fruit *arhatta* is not attained by any householder, hence it is beyond the range of achievements of a lay-devotee.[2]

In view of the several statements in the Nikāyas about the after-life of an upāsaka, it is clear that no upāsaka attained arhathood,

1 *Saṃyutta*, v. p. 375.

2 See, *Infra*.

i.e., Nibbāna. In the *Aggivacchagottasutta*[1] it is explicitly stated that no householder without giving up the householder's life can end his suffering at the time of his death. In other words, he can be only at the most an Anāgāmi, i.e., he must be born once more as a god to attain Nibbāna.

There was a controversy between the Theravādins and the Uttarāpathakas, and recently between Prof. de la Vallée Poussin and Dr. B. C. Law[2] on the point whether a householder could become an arhat (*Gihi 'ssa arahā ti?*).[3] The Uttarāpathakas and Dr. B. C. Law relied on certain passages of the Nikāyas, in which a few householders are mentioned as having become *arhats*. The Uttarāpathakas cited the instances of Yasa Kulaputta, Uttiya gahapati and Setu Māṇava,[4] while Dr. B. C. Law drew his support from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (iii, p. 451), in which it is said that Sudatta gahapati (=Anāthapiṇḍika), Citta gahapati, Uggo gahapati and a few other householders realised the immortal (*amataddaso*), i.e. Nibbāna. The remark in the *Majjhima Nikāya*[5] that a householder could realise the excellent truth is discussed in the *Milindapañha* (p. 243), in which Milinda raised the question that if a householder or a recluse could attain the truth by following the right course, there was no necessity for a person to become a monk. Again he questioned if countless householders visualised the truth, what was the good of taking recourse to the ascetic practices (*dhutaṅgas*).[6] Nāgasena gave an

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 483: Natthi koci gihī gihisaṃyojanam appahāya kāyassa bhedā dukkhass' antakaro 'ti.

2 *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute*, xiv, p. 72.

3 *Kathāvatthu*, iv, 1.

4 *Ibid.*

5 Cf. *Majjhima*, ii, p. 197: gahaṭṭho ārādhako hoti ñeyaṃ dhammaṃ kusalaṃ.

6 *Milindapañha*, p. 350.

evasive answer and dilated on the merits of renunciation and observance of *dhutaṅga* precepts, and avoided the issue by stating that those householders who realised the truth had practised the *dhutaṅgas* in their previous lives.

The passage relied on by Dr. B. C. Law no doubt speaks of the gahapatis having been *amataddaso,* but in the same Nikāya and elsewhere Buddha declared at Nadika that none of the Upāsakas mentioned there became arhats. Nakulapitā and Jīvaka became a Sotāpanna, Sudatta a Sakadāgāmi,[1] Ugga and Citta became Anāgāmis.[2] The Theravādins[3] contended that a householder in the enjoyment of worldly pleasures could not normally be expected to become arhats. In the similar strain Nāgasena stated that on the very day that a householder attained *arhathood,* he must either die or take the yellow robe.[4] Prof. de la Vallée Poussin also held the opinion that a layman, however faithful or virtuous he might be, could not attain Nibbāna.[5] Buddhaghosa explained the anomaly by saying that Yasa, Uttiya and Setu were mere householders in name, in external dress but not spiritually; they were free from all worldly ties though they had not yet discarded the white dress of a householder.[6] The conclusion that should be drawn from the conflicting statements in the Nikāyas

1 See above, p. 233.

2 *Saṃyutta,* iv. p. 301. Cf. Malalasekera, *Dictionary,* s.v., Citta, Nakulapitā, Jīvaka.

3 *Kathāvatthu,* iv. 1.

4 *Milindapañha,* p. 265.

5 *The Way to Nirvāṇa,* p. 150-151.

6 Cf. *Papañcasūdani,* iii, p. 196: Santati the minister, Uggasena the banker's son, Vitasoka the young boy attained arhathood while in householder's dress, but the householder's dress *(gihiliṅgaṃ)* cannot uphold the merit of an *arhat* and so they must either die or retire on the very day *arhathood* is attained by them.

about the attainments of an upāsaka and the controversies in the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Milindapañha*, is that normally a householder could not become an arhat, but there were exceptional cases of householders who became so spiritually advanced that they deserved *arhathood* but the convention was that no householder unless he gave up his household life would be recognised as an *arhat*. Upāsakas like Citta and Hatthaka, and Upāsikās like Khujjuttarā and Nandamātā were more spiritually advanced than many monks and nuns, but still they were *sekhas* and not *asekhas* (= arhats).[1] They are said to have destroyed the *orambhāgīya* impurities[2] but not the five *uddhambhāgīyas:* viz., *rūparāga, arūparāga, māna, uddhacca,* and *avijjā,* and hence, they could not attain *arhathood.*[3]

1 Cf. *Visuddhimagga,* p. 442: Cittagahapati, Upāligahapati, Dhammika-upāsaka, Khujjuttarā upāsikā acquired *paṭisambhidā* of the *Sekhabhūmi.*

2 Cf. *Majjhima,* i, pp. 467, 490-1.

3 In the *Aṅguttara,* (iv, p. 456), it is stated that one cannot be an arhat without removing *rāga, dosa, moha, kodha, upanāha, makkha, palāsa, issā,* and *macchariya.*

CHAPTER XIII

THE MAURYAS AND BUDDHISM

Mahāpadma Nanda, according to the testimony of the Buddhist historians, patronised Buddhism and died as a true Buddhist (see above, p. 24). That he was not well disposed towards the Brāhmins is evidenced by the episode of Cāṇakya, whose claim as the leading Brāhmaṇa of the time in Pupphapura[1] on account of his extraordinary proficiency in the Brāhmaṇical lore was rejected by Mahāpadma Nanda. It is also not improbable that for his Buddhist leanings he lost his throne through the machinations of his Brahmin ministers. His reign was however marked in the Buddhist ecclesiastical history by several controversies and appearance of un-orthodox views within the Saṅgha. These controversies went on unabated and gave rise to several new sects, a survey of which is given in the previous chapters.

Candragupta

The story of the accession of Candragupta to the Magadhan throne with the help of Brāhmaṇa minister Cāṇakya is too well-known to be repeated here.[2] Dr. Ray Chaudhuri identifies the

1 *Vaṃsaṭṭhappakāsinī*, pp. 182 ff.

2 In the *Vaṃsatthappakāsinī*, p. 181, the story of the meeting of Cāṇakya with Candragupta is given as follows:—Cāṇakya went to Puṣpapura for entering into disputation with the learned brāhmaṇas of the place, and by defeating them wanted to become the chief brāhmaṇa (*Saṅghabrāhmaṇa*). King Nanda, however, was displeased with his uncouth appearance and turned him out of the assembly of brāhmaṇas. Cāṇakya thereupon fled and took shelter at the palace of the

Moriyas of the *Mahāvaṃsa* tradition with the Moriyas of Pippahalivana mentioned in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* as one of the claimants to the relies of Buddha and holds that Candragupta belonged to the Moriya clan of Pipphalivana, who were Kṣatriyas.[1] Candragupta carried on a long struggle to wrest the throne from the Nandas as also to extend his dominion from the Panjab to as far south as the northern border of Mysore, and from Magadha to Surāṣṭra in Western India.[2]

It is apparent that Candragupta's reign was a reign of conquests and that he had hardly any peaceful respite. Though he was surrounded by Brāhmaṇa ministers, it seems that his faith was not wholly Brāhmaṇic. It is said that he sought the air of a Jaṭila ascetic to quell certain disorders in his dominion and that towards the end of his life, he preferred to live the life of a Jaina ascetic and retired to a lonely place in the southern border of his empire.[3]

Candragupta, as the tradition goes, abdicated the throne in favour of his son, Siṃhasena. It was however not Siṃhasena but Bindusāra who succeeded to his throne. It may be that Candragupta, for his non-brāhmaṇic leanings in the latter part of his life, lost the confidence of Brāhmin ministers, who, in defiance of his wishes, placed another son of his on the throne—a son who

son of Pabbatarāja. From there he escaped to the Vindhyā forest, where he collected money and also came across Candragupta, who was then being brought up by a hunter. He found him more suitable for kingship than the son of Pabbatarāja, and so he bought him up by 1000 kahāpaṇas and gave him the requisite training.

1 *Political History of Ancient India*, 3rd ed., p. 181.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 182-4.

3 Shah, *Jainism in North India*, p. 131; Mookerji, *Candragupta Maurya and his times*, p. 23.

was more sympathetic towards Brāhmanism and perhaps promised support to the Brahmin ministers.

In the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (p. 612), Candragupta is given the credit of making the kingdom free from enemies. He is described as a righteous and meditative person and a seeker of the truth, but on coming into contact with evil friends, he killed many living beings and ultimately died, putting Bindusāra on the throne surrounded by evil ministers.

The chief evil minister whom the author of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* had in mind was of course Cāṇakya the arch enemy of the Buddhists. He writes that Cāṇakya perfected himself in the *Yamāntaka-siddhi* and was the personification of anger. He lived long and acted as the minister not only of Candragupta but also of his son and grandson.[1]

Bindusāra

Bindusāra, influenced and surrounded as he was by the Brāhmaṇa ministers, the chief of whom was Cāṇakya, lent his support to Brāhmanism. In the *Samantapāsādikā*,[2] as also in the *Mahāvaṃsa*[3] it is stated that Bindusāra fed 60,000 brāhmaṇas and members of the brāhmanical religious orders. The Buddhist historians have mostly passed over the name of Bindusāra, proving thereby the king's lukewarmness if not antipathy towards Buddhism. Inspite of Bindusāra's lack of interest, the progress of the religion did not suffer any serious set-back.[4] The

1 Cf. Buston II, p. 118: "King Nanda's reign will dure 56 years and his friend will be the Brāhmin Pāṇini. Then there will appear the king Candragupta, and after him his son Bindusāra who will rule for 70 years. The minister of these kings, Cāṇakya, will depart to hell."

2 *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 44.

3 *Mahāvaṃsa*, V, 34.

4 Tāranātha (German transl., p. 89) states that Bindusāra with the

chief centre of Buddhism remained in Magadha, although the new sects, which came into existence a few decades ago, preferred to move away from this ancient centre to find a home for themselves in different parts of India. We may say that during the reign of Bindusāra, the Theravādins shifted their centre to Avantī, the Sarvāstivādins to Mathurā, the Mahīśāsakas to Mysore, and the Mahāsaṅghikas to the Andhra country, but all of them had their adherents living in the monasteries of Magadha.

Aśoka

The two outstanding Maurya rulers, Candragupta and Aśoka, put into shade the glories of the other rulers of this dynasty. Candragupta again was surpassed by his grandson Aśoka, who not only extended his dominion but also consolidated his vast empire and brought peace and happiness to his innumerable subjects. He had the rare courage and intelligence to see through the aims and activities of his ministers and never allowed himself to be ruled by them. Untramelled by the age-long traditional beliefs and customs, he freely exercised his power of judgment in order to distinguish the right from the wrong, be it a secular or a religious matter. No reliable history of this great ruler, to our regret, has come down to us but

help of Cāṇakya extended his dominion from the eastern to the western ocean......During the reign of this king a monastery called Kusumālaṅkāra was built at Kusumapura. In this monastery lived Ācārya Mātṛceta, who spread both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. About this time Bindusāra's brother's son king Śrīcandra erected a temple of Avalokiteśvara and maintained 2000 monks of the Mahāyāna school. Tāranātha, it seems, had made some confusion of the name of Bindusāra with that of a later king.

many distinguished scholars have reconstructed the history of this great man from the several inscriptions left by him, and the traditions preserved in the Buddhist-Sanskrit and Pāli texts. These traditions[1] have not been so exhaustively studied as the inscriptions and so we have thought it fit to give them here in bare outlines to enable the readers to find out from the mass of legends the common nuclei which might be taken as authentic.

Buddhist-Sanskrit Traditions

Succession: Bindusāra married a brahmin girl and had by her two sons Aśoka and Vītaśoka.[2] One day he enquired of Piṅgalavatsa, an Ājīvaka monk, as to which of his sons would ascend the throne after him, and found out from Piṅgalavatsa's hint that Aśoka would succeed him. Piṅgalavatsa, after making this prophecy, left the place for a border country for safety. About this time, there was a revolt at Takṣaśilā. To quell the revolt Bindusāra deputed Aśoka, who carried out the mission successfully. Meanwhile, Bindusāra's ministers became displeased with the manners of Susīma, the eldest son of Bindusāra, and wanted to place Aśoka on the throne, though it was not the will of the old king. A fight ensued between Aśoka and Susīma, and the latter was ultimately killed and Aśoka seized the throne. Susīma's valiant soldiers, who were left alive, entered the Buddhist Saṅgha as monks, and in course of time, became *arhats*.

1 There are four Aśokan stories in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 369-434), viz., *Paṃsupradāna*, *Kuṇāla*, *Vītaśoka* and *Aśoka*.

2 Wassiljew's notes in Tāranātha's *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, p. 287; *Divyā.*, p. 369.

Conversion: After accession to the throne, Aśoka put the old ministers, excepting Rādhagupta, to death. He made Rādhagupta his chief minister.[1] At his advice he appointed a hangman called Caṇḍagirika, who by nature was cruel and ferocious. Aśoka built for him a house, into which, it was ordained, whoever should enter would be put to death by Caṇḍagirika. The house was similar in conception to the hell described in the Buddhist text called *Bālapaṇḍita Sūtra*. One day, a bhikṣu called Samudra unknowingly entered into the house and was placed on fire, but he could not be burnt to death. On the other hand, he showed some miracles and reiterated the prophecy of the Teacher that one hundred years after his *parinirvāṇa*, Aśoka would become the monarch with his capital at Pāṭaliputra, and that he would propagate the religion widely by erecting *stūpas* over the relics of the Teacher. On hearing this episode of Samudra, Aśoka became repentant, confessed his sins, and asked for pardon. He ultimately took refuge in the saint, in the Buddha and in his *Dharma*.[2] After developing faith in the *Triratna* he used to salute the monks everywhere, whether alone or in the midst of many, much to the chagrin of his minister Yaśas, who, although a devotee of Buddha, wanted the king to discriminate among the monks by their original castes but Aśoka resented the idea and explained to him how mistaken was his notion.[3]

Erection of Stūpas: At this time, Bhikṣu Yaśas was the Saṅghatthera at Pāṭaliputra, where was situated the monastery

1. In one of their previous lives, it is said that Rādhagupta approved the gift made by Aśoka when as a child he gave some mud as rice-gruel to Buddha who accepted the gift and foretold that Aśoka would be reborn as a king of Pāṭaliputra and disseminate his religion. See *Divyā.*, p. 402. 2 *Divyā.*, p. 380. 3 *Divyā.*, p. 382.

Kurkuṭārāma. Aśoka approached him and expressed his desire to erect *stūpas* over the relics. He had the relics deposited in the *stūpas* erected by Ajātaśatru and others opened up, dividing them into several portions for constructing *stūpas* over them at different places. All these *stūpas* were completed on the same day and hour, and from that day onwards Aśoka came to be known as Dharmāśoka instead of Caṇḍāśoka.

About this time he heard the name of Upagupta, the renowned monk of Mathurā, and probably the *Saṅghatthera* of the place, and became anxious to make his acquaintance. Upagupta also, on coming to know of Aśoka's change of heart and desire to propagate the religion, came down to Pāṭaliputra and was royally received by the king. Aśoka laid bare his heart before him and declared that he was prepared to sacrifice his self, son, house, wife, treasury and kingdom for the sake of the religion[1] and that he wanted his help to propagate the religion further by marking the spots sanctified by the Teacher by his presence on different occasions during his life-time. A detailed geographical account of the peregrinations of Buddha was then given by Upagupta,[2] and Aśoka marked every spot sanctified by Buddha's presence by a *stūpa*.

The spots sanctified by the demise of Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Vakkula and Ānanda were also pointed out by Upagupta and marked by Aśoka with *stūpas*.

1 *Divyā.*, p. 388:

आत्मापुत्रं गृहं दारान् पृथिवीं कोशमेव च ।
न किञ्चिदपरित्यक्तं धर्मराजस्य शासने ॥ Cf. also, pp. 403, 429.

2 He was first taken to Lumbinivana, then to the different sites of Kapilāvastu, then the meeting places of Gautama with Bimbisāra, Ārāḍa, Rudraka, Nandabālā. Then he was shown Bodhimūla, the way to Vārāṇaśī, Ṛṣipatana and Kuśinagara. Cf. Watters, II, p. 91.

Quinquennial ceremonies of gifts: Aśoka then instituted the quinquennial assemblies of Buddhist monks[1] for offering gifts to monks of all quarters which included Tamasāvana (in Kashmir), Revataka (in Mahāvana), Śairīṣaka (in Anavataptahrada), and Gandhamādana mountains. After taking bath he used to put on new clothes with wide borders,[2] observe the eight *śīlas* prescribed for the lay-devotees, and then make his offerings to the monks of all quarters.

In the quinquennial assembly, he came across two *Ubhayatobhāgavimuktau arhats,*[3] and out of deep veneration for them, he started offering robes to the monks in addition to food.

Bathing Bodhi-tree: Besides his offerings to the monks, he worshipped the Bodhi-tree and spent large sums on its worship. His devotion to the Bodhi-tree rose to such a pitch that it even roused the jealousy of his queen Tiṣyarakṣitā, who once contrived to have the Bodhi-tree destroyed. At the instance of Piṇḍola Bharadvāja he instituted the ceremony of bathing the Bodhi-tree, before offering gifts to the monks.

Buddha's Image: While holding the quinquennial ceremony of gifts, he found out that the oldest monk living at the time was Piṇḍola Bharadvāja, who was then residing at a place on the north of Śararājya in the Gandhamādana mountains, and that he had seen Buddha many times. He listened to his description of Buddha's figure, which was endowed with all the major and minor signs. He was highly pleased with the account

1 *Divyā.*, p. 398: आर्यसंघस्य च करिष्यामि सत्कारं पञ्चवार्षिकम् ।

2 *Divyā.*, p. 398: स्नात्वाहतानि वासांसि नवानि दीर्घदशानि प्रावृत्याष्टाङ्गसमन्वागतमुपवासमुपोष्य etc.

3 *Divyā.*, p. 404. For the two classes of Arhats, see *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 276.

but there is no mention of Aśoka's attempt to make an image.

Conversion of Vītaśoka: When Aśoka had become an ardent devotee of Buddha, erected several stūpas, instituted the quinquennial offerings to the Saṅgha and gave alms daily to countless monks, his brother continued to be an adherent of a non-Buddhist sect, condemning the Śākyaputrīya Śramaṇas as unfit for attaining emancipation on account of their easy going life.[1] In order to convince Vītaśoka of the excellence of the Buddhist way of life, Aśoka put his brother on the throne with all the royal parapharnelia for one week on the condition that he would be put to death after that time. Vītaśoka could not enjoy his royalty due to fear of death and became emaciated. Then Aśoka pointed out to him that how the Buddhist monks, who constantly cogitated on the end of their lives, could enjoy food and other articles of use. Vītaśoka realised the value of Aśoka's instruction and became a convert to Buddhism. He was ordained by Yaśas, the Saṅghasthavira of Kurkuṭārāma. He, however, being a member of the royal family, received too much attention from the people of Pāṭaliputra, and so seeking solitude he went to a monastery in Videha to complete his spiritual exercises. After attaining *arhathood,* Vītaśoka paid a visit to Aśoka, and delivered to him and Rādhagupta a discourse.

Beheading of Ascetics: Vītaśoka went to a border country Puṇḍravardhana where he fell ill, but was cured by the medicine sent by Aśoka. During his illness, his hairs, nails etc. grew, and his look and dress appeared like that of an Ājīvaka ascetic. At this time, certain Nirgrantha (Ājīvaka) devotees of Puṇḍra-

1 *Divyā.*, p. 419: नास्ति शाक्यपुत्रीयाणां मोक्ष इति । Cf. Watters, II, pp. 93 ff.

vardhana showed disrespect to a Buddha-image. This enraged Aśoka, who ordered the death of all Ājīvakas, and even fixed the price of one *dinara* for every head of a Nirgrantha. Vītaśoka was mistaken as a Nirgrantha ascetic and was beheaded. This gave a very rude shock to Aśoka.

Last days of Aśoka: Aśoka began to multiply his gifts to the Saṅgha, and this drained the treasury so much that his gifts had to be forcibly stopped by the Crown-prince Sampadi,[1] son of Kuṇāla. Evidently Aśoka was now in his dotage and could no longer exercise his royal power freely, and had to remain satisfied by giving to the Saṅgha whatever he could lay hold of.[2] Rādhagupta continued to be his minister up to his last days.

Pāli Traditions

The following traditions are preserved in the Ceylonese chronicles in Pāli.

Succession: The family priest Janāsana ājīvaka foretold that Aśoka would succeed Bindusāra to the throne. This Ājīvaka monk was later ordained by Assagutta at Vattanīya hermitage

1 According to the Jaina tradition, Aśoka was followed by Kuṇāla and Samprati. The latter, as Smith observes, promoted the cause of Jainism as Aśoka did of Buddhism. See K. T. Shah, *Jainism in North India*, pp. 138, 144-5. The inscriptions on Nāgārjuni Hill too indicate that Daśaratha's leanings were towards the Ājīvakas, an offshoot of the Jainas. See *Infra.*, p. 254.

According to *Divyā.*, p. 432, the successors of Aśoka were Samapadi-Bṛhaspati-Vṛṣasena-Puṣyadharma-Puṣyamitra, the last of whom announced 100 dināras for every head of a Buddhist monk.

According to the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Kuṇāla reigned for eight years. He was followed by his son Bandhupālita. His successors were Indrapālita-Devavarman-Śatadhanus-Bṛhadratha. See *Infra.*, p. 254.

2 Cf. Watters, II, p. 99.

and became the preceptor of Aśoka in his early days.[1] Aśoka was at Ujjeni when his father was in the death-bed. He hurried back to the capital and, after killing 99 step-brothers, seized the throne of Magadha. The eldest son of Bindusāra was Sumana. It took him four years to consolidate his powers. He formally crowned himself as the king of Magadha and made his uterine brother Tissa the Crown-prince.

Conversion: He was continuing the family tradition of feeding several brāhmaṇas, but he became dissatisfied with the unseemly manner of the brāhmaṇas. At this time, he met Nigrodha Sāmaṇera, who was a posthumous son of Sumana, the eldest son of Bindusāra. He listened to his discourse on *Appamāda* (diligence) and was very much impressed by Nigrodha's demeanour and arranged daily food for him and his fellow brethren, in place of the non-Buddhists whom he had been feeding so long.[2]

Erection of Stūpas: Learning from Moggaliputta Tissa, that there were 84,000 *dharmas*, he decided to build one monastery for each dharma.[3] He made lavish gifts to the *Triratna*. All these monasteries were completed on the same day and hour. He built *caityas* on the spots sanctified by Buddha's presence.[5] He ordered that all men observing uposatha

1 *Vaṃsaṭṭhappakāsinī*, I, p. 192-3: This incident is recorded in the *Sīhalaṭṭhakathā* in the commentary on Cūḷasīhanādasutta of the *Majjhimasaṅgīti*. This however is not found in Buddhaghoṣa's commentary.

2 This information is derived from *Vinayaṭṭhakathā* and not *Mahāvaṃsaṭṭhakathā*. See *Vaṃsaṭṭhappakāsinī*, I, p. 207.

3 Cf. *Divyā.*, p. 419: यदा राज्ञाशोकेन भगवच्छासने श्रद्धा प्रतिलब्धा तेन चतुरशीतिधर्मराजिकासहस्रं प्रतिष्ठापितं पञ्चवार्षिकं च कृतम् etc. see also p. 429.

4 *Mahāvaṃsa*, V. 175.

should congregate for worship.[1] From that day onwards, he became known as Dharmāśoka instead of Caṇḍāśoka.[2]

Buddha's image: He had an image of Buddha endowed with all the major and minor signs made by Mahākāla Nāga. Then he instituted the ceremony of the worship of Buddha-image.

Conversion of Tissa, the Crown-prince: Tissa doubted the efficacy of the Buddhist way of life. In order to convince him of its excellence, Aśoka put him on the throne for seven days on the condition that he would be put to death after that time. Tissa became pale and emaciated and could not enjoy his royalty. The king then pointed out to him how the monks, who constantly thought of death, could enjoy worldly pleasures. Tissa was converted and was ordained by Mahādhammarakkhita the Yonaka. After Tissa, Aggibrahmā, the nephew and son-in-law of Aśoka, as also Aggibrahmā's son, Sumana, took ordination. Then followed the ordination of Mahinda and Saṃghamittā. Moggaliputta Tissa became the *upajjhāya* of Mahinda, Mahādeva the *ācariya,* and Majjhantika gave the *kammavācā*.

Medicines: On hearing that a bhikkhu called Tissa died for want of medicine, Aśoka made arrangements for giving medicines to the monks.

Beheading of unorthodox monks: Aśoka ordered that all monks should observe the fortnightly *uposatha*. On the refusal of the orthodox monks to carry out the order of the king, his minister began to behead them, when the king's brother Tissa intervened by offering his head. When this was brought to the notice of the king, he was shocked and sought advice for exoneration from such a hineous act. This led to the arrival of

1 *Mahāvaṃsa,* V. 182. 2 *Ibid.,* V. 189.

Moggaliputta Tissa, who had retired to the forest, at Pāṭaliputra.

The two traditions compared

The above two traditions preserved in Sanskrit and Pāli, evidently have a common basis, which may be briefly stated thus: —

(i) Aśoka's mother had Ājīvaka leanings though Bindusāra followed the brāhmanical religion.

(ii) Aśoka secured the throne of Magadha after a fatricidal war, in which all of his step-brothers were killed, leaving a posthumous son of his eldest brother, and his uterine brother called Vītaśoka in the Sanskrit, Tissa in the Pāli tradition.

(iii) Aśoka was converted to Buddhism by Samudra or Nigrodha. The former probably belonged to the entourage of the eldest son of Bindusāra, as it is said in the Sanskrit tradition that the valiant soldiers of Susīma (in Pāli Sumana) became *arhats*. Nigrodha also is described as the posthumous son of Sumana. Hence the conversion was made by somebody connected with Susīma or Sumana.

(iv) Aśoka erected several monasteries, and *stūpas* over the spots sanctified by Buddha's presence.

(v) In the Sanskrit tradition, emphasis is laid on the worship of Bodhi-tree while in Pāli on the worship of Buddha's image.

(vi) The story of the conversion of Aśoka's brother Vītaśoka or Tissa is almost identical.

(vii) In Sanskrit, the story of the quinquennial assembly of monks is given in detail and seems to have a historical basis as it is echoed in the Aśokan inscriptions.[1] The Ceylonese

1 See Rock Edict III.

chronicles very probably utilised this tradition of quinquennial assembly for their story of the Third Council and edification of the Theravāda sect.[1]

(viii) The story of the beheading of ascetics including Vītaśoka is echoed in the Ceylonese tradition of the beheading of the unorthodox monks, but the former story appears to be more plausible. In any case, the underlying fact is that Aśoka did commit the blunder of ordering death of some ascetics.

(ix) In both the traditions, there is no mention of Aśoka having taken ordination and joined the Saṅgha. All that we have is that on ceremonial occasions Aśoka observed the eight *śīlas* like a good *upāsaka*.

(x) Aśoka's gifts to the Saṅgha were endless. In Ceylonese tradition, however, the enormity of gifts is not so much emphasised upon as his consent to the ordination of his son and daughter, who were responsible for propagating Buddhism in Ceylon. It may be that the Sanskrit writers were not interested in this propagation and so passed over the incident as unimportant.

(xi) The *Saṅghatthera* of Pāṭaliputra is called in the Sanskrit texts as Yaśas while in Pāli, it is Yonaka Dhammarakkhita. Prominence is given to Upagupta of Mathurā in the Sanskrit traditions and Moggaliputta Tissa in Pāli. This is evidently a result of the sectarian bias. Upagupta was a Sarvāstivādin and so he is mentioned in the Sanskrit texts belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. He is ignored in the Theravāda tradition preserved in Pāli, which puts up the name of Moggaliputta Tissa in stead. Both Upagupta and Moggaliputta Tissa might be historical persons, but their position as a religious adviser of Aśoka should be discounted.

1 See *Infra*.

(xii) In conclusion, it may be remarked that Aśoka might not have been as tolerant as he posed to be in his Edicts, at least in his early days. It may be that in his old age he realised his mistake of supporting one sect as against another and felt repentant, and in order to atone for his misguided deeds, he began to preach toleration.

Aśoka's successors (232-185 B.C.)

There is yet a great deal of uncertainty about the successors of Aśoka. From the Seventh Pillar Edict it is evident that Aśoka had many queens and sons. This is corroborated by the Buddhist legends about Aśoka as also by Tāranātha, who writes that Aśoka had eleven sons.[1] Names of four sons have come down to us. These are:—

(i) Tīvara, son of Queen Kāruvākī of the Aśokan inscriptions; he was the viceroy of Takṣaśilā, Ujjayinī, Suvarṇagiri and Tosali.[2]

(ii) Kuṇāla (also known as Dharmavivardhana and Suyaśas), son of Queen Padmāvatī; he was deputed to Takṣaśilā for suppressing the rising of the Frontier Tribes, and was rendered blind through the machinations of his step-mother Tiṣyarakṣitā.[3]

(iii) Mahinda, son of the Vidisa lady married by Aśoka when he was the viceroy at Ujjayinī; he was the famous apostle to Ceylon;[4] and

1 Schiefner, *Geschichte des Buddhismus etc.*, p. 48.

2 Raychaudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

3 Raychaudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 238; Watters I, p. 246; Przyluski, *La légende de l'empereur Aśoka*, p. 109; Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

4 See *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, p. 610; Schiefner, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 48; Bu-ston, II, p. 118; *Divyāvadāna*, p. 430; Watters, II, p. 100; Raychaudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 238, Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

(iv) Jaluka of the Kashmirian tradition.

Of the grandsons of Aśoka, the names of only two have come down to us:—

(i) Sampadi or Viśoka[1] (restored by Schiefner from Tibetan as Vītāśoka or Vigatāśoka), son of Kuṇāla; he acted as Aśoka's treasurer and stopped the emperor's unending largess to the Buddhist Saṅgha, and later succeeded him; and

(ii) Daśaratha of the Purāṇic tradition and Aśokan inscriptions; he was a patron of the Ājīvakas.

There is very little information about the succeeding rulers of the Mauryan line,[2] the last of which is said to be Bṛhadratha, whose assasinator is wrongly recorded in the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 433) as the Maurya king.[3]

The lavish gifts made by the Emperor on the various religious organisations and specially on the Buddhist Saṅgha met with a natural reaction in the hands of his successors. They disavowed the religion patronised by Aśoka and indicated their antipathy by supporting Jainism, Ājīvakism and Śivaism to the exclusion of Buddhism.

1 Schiefner restores Vigatāśoka from Tibetan མྱ་ངན་བྲལ which may be restored as Viśoka as given in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, p. 610.

Nanda (དགའ་བོ) is described as the grandson of Viśoka and son of Śūrasena (not Vīrasena). See *Mmk.*, p. 613; Watters, II, p. 97; Schiefner, p. 53.

2 According to Tāranātha, Aśoka was succeeded by his grandson Viśoka followed by Viśoka's son Śūrasena—his son Nanda, who was a contemporary of Pāṇini—then Mahāpadma (see Schiefner, p. 52) whose contemporaries were Sthiramati, Bhadra and Vararuci.

There is another tradition (Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 287): Sampadi-Bṛhaspati-Vṛṣasena-Puṣyavarman-Puṣyamitra.

3 See Raychaudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

Jalauka

The story of Jalauka, as given in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī,* reveals that he supported the Nāga and Śiva cults of Kashmir and persecuted the Buddhists.[1] In the legend of Kṛtyā he is referred to as one who persecuted the Buddhists and destroyed the *vihāras.* His heart, however, was softened by the Bodhisattva ideal—the new aspect of Buddhism that had just then emerged. The Hīnayāna Buddhists are painted in black and they are described as bent on taking revenge for his cruel acts. He built the Kṛtyāśrama vihāra and dedicated it not to Buddha but to the sorceress Kṛtyā. He directed his energies and munificence to the erection of Śiva temples and, possibly, it was an attempt to resuscitate Śivaism, which had waned in Kashmir owing to the popularity of Buddhism under Aśoka's patronage.

Daśaratha

The anti-Buddhistic spirit of Daśaratha may be inferred from his gifts to the Ājīvakas and the silence of the Buddhist texts about his reign.

Sampadi

The anti-Buddhistic spirit of Samapadi is apparent from his disapproval of Aśoka's gifts to the Buddhist Saṅgha as also from the Jaina accounts of his activities for the propagation of Jaina faith and the establishment of vihāras for śramaṇas in the non-Aryan countries.[2] Tāranātha's discreet silence over the events of his rule indicate also his unfavourable attitude towards the Buddhists.

1 *Rājat.* I, pp. 136, 140-4; see Kṣemendra, *Samaya Mātṛkā,* v. 61.
2 Roychaudhury, *op. cit.,* p. 239; see also *I.H.Q.,* 1930, p. 343.

Puṣyamitra

The climax of anti-Buddhistic feelings of Aśoka's successors is narrated in the *Divyāvadāna* and *Aśokāvadāna*, in which Puṣyamitra is described as wishing to surpass his renowned predecessor Aśoka by undoing the works done by him.[1] He razed the *stūpas* and *vihāras* to the ground and put the price of 100 *dinaras* on the head of every Buddhist śramaṇa. Mr. Havell, however, offers a valuable suggestion in explanation of this violent attitude of Puṣyamitra towards the Buddhists. He writes that Puṣyamitra's animus was not against "Buddhism as a religion but against the Saṅgha as a political power. If there is any truth in the Buddhist tradition, it is likely that some members of the Saṅgha were concerned in conspiracies against the Suṅga dynasty",[2] and it was they who kindled the fire of wrath of the new sovereign. There is much reason in this view of Mr. Havell, for Buddhism as a religion did not suffer a very serious set back during or after Puṣyamitra's reign. The Buddhist monuments of the pre-Christian era that have so far been discovered, the composition of the Buddhist works like the *Milindapañha*, *Lalitavistara* and *Mahāvastu* about the 2nd or 1st century B.C., the development of the Abhidhamma literatures of the different schools of thought, and the multiplication of Jātaka and Avadāna stories a little before or after the beginning of the Christian era prove beyond doubt that the strength of the religion, which it had already acquired by sending its roots deep down and wide into the several regions of the land of its birth continued unabated notwithstanding the lack of sympathy

1 Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 301-2; *Divyā.*, p. 434; Schiefner, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

2 Havell, *History of Aryan Rule in India*, p. 123.

of Aśoka's successors. The story of the persecution of Puṣyamitra can be taken as suggesting that the religion, which almost monopolised the patronage of Aśoka, was disowned by the state during Puṣyamitra's reign, for many reasons, one of which, as apprehended by Mr. Havell, was the probable political moves of the Buddhist monks against the advent of the new line of kings, not in favour of the Buddhists.

CHAPTER XIV

Aśoka's Dhamma

There is nothing in the Edicts nor in the Buddhist traditions to prove that Aśoka took up the cause of Buddhism as against Brāhmanism, though there are ample evidences to show that Aśoka had a great, if not the highest, regard for Buddha and his teachings. During the first few years of his reign, he maintained the family tradition of feeding the brāhmaṇas[1] which even now is regarded as a meritorious act. This institution came into vogue for supporting a spiritually minded cultured class, who were unmindful about earning their livelihood. In course of time, it became a ritualistic affair, the original object of which was lost sight of. It did not however take Aśoka long to find out that the essential object of feeding the brāhmaṇas was more overlooked than observed. With his discriminating vision he took the right course of replacing the undeserving brāhmaṇas by deserving monks or ascetics, brāhmanical or non-brāhmanical. He no doubt deviated from the traditional convention, and it behoved a man of his courage and conviction to do so. That Aśoka was an out and out radicalist and a rationalist is clearly revealed in his Edicts. He cared neither for the brāhmanical rituals and traditions nor for the Jaina or Buddhist forms of ceremonies and observances. He was neither fond of a brāhmanical *guru* nor of a Buddhist *thera* nor of a Jaina *sādhu*. He had his own ideals of religion—an

1 Cf. *Mahāvaṃsa*, V, 34:
Pitā saṭṭhisahassāni brāhmaṇe brahmapakkhike
bhojesi, so pi te yeva tīṇi vassāni bhojayi.
R.E. VIII, says "Aśoka gave gifts to brāhmaṇas and ascetics."

ideal which would not bear a sectarian name. In forming the conception of his ideal, he was undoubtedly influenced by the Buddhist and Jaina teachings, but he was not enamoured of the Buddhist or Jaina ideal of retirement from worldly life. He stood against the brāhmanical practice of killing animals for religious purposes, and dissuaded his subjects from performing brāhmanical rituals, which to him were meaningless. From a study of his inscriptions we may outline his religion (*Dhamma*) thus: —

(i) Heavenly life hereafter: Aśoka repeatedly stressed upon the desirability of a happy life hereafter, and for that he advised his subjects to be virtuous, to make gifts and to earn merits, as these would bring about happiness in this as also in the next world.[1] There is no pessimistic vein in his teachings nor does he speak of the impermanence of worldly objects. Nowhere do we find in the Edicts any reference to the attainment of Nirvāṇa or the Absolute as the *summum bonum* of life. This shows that Aśoka espoused the religion of the laity and not that of the recluses, to whom heavenly existence was as much undesirable as worldly existence.

(ii) Ethical teaching (elementary): The ethical teachings imparted by Aśoka were the usual day to day rules and customs followed by an average householder. These were,—hearkening to parents, reverence to teachers, liberality

1 R.E. VI: That they may gain heaven in the next world.

R.E. IX: With this, it is possible to attain heaven (G.D. & J. Texts); it begets endless merit in the next world (K.S. & M. Texts).

R.E. XIII: That which concerns the next world, the Beloved of the gods esteems as alone bearing great fruit.........That (the conquest through Dhamma) is for here and hereafter (p. 332). See Bhandarkar's *Aśoka* (3rd ed.), pp. 331-2, 340, 341, 342.

and seemly behaviour towards friends, acquaintances and relatives, and towards Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa ascetics, and also towards slaves and servants.[1] This teaching, as pointed out by Profs. Bhandarkar, Barua and others is an echo of the instructions given by Buddha to Sigāla the householder, and may be traced in the *Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, Aṅguttara Nikāya* and other works, in passages which were addressed to some householders and had nothing to do with the precepts prescribed for the Buddhist monks and laymen. It will be observed that Aśoka imparted this teaching only in the earlier years of his reign, the Edicts being dated mostly in the 12th year.

(iii) Ethical teaching (higher): Aśoka wanted that some of his subjects should reach a level higher than that of an average householder and it was from these he expected *sādhave* (much good), *apāsinava* (freedom from evils) such as strong desire (*chaṃdiyā*), cruelty, anger, conceit, and envy (P. E. III), *dayā* (mercy), *dāne* (liberality), *sace* (truthfulness), *socaye* (purity), and *mādave* (gentleness). (Bhandarkar, p. 104). In this list of duties and virtues there is nothing particularly Buddhistic, and if, as Prof. Bhandarkar suggests, that Aśoka utilised the *Lakkhaṇasutta,* it should be observed that he omitted the words *śīla* and *uposatha,* occurring in the verse referred to,[2] indicating that his *dhamma* was different from that of the lay-Buddhists.

(iv) Ethical teaching (highest): There

1 Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

2 *Dīgha,* III, p. 147:

Sacce ca dhamme ca dame ca saṃyame
Soceyya-sīlālay-uposathesu ca
Dāne ahiṃsāya asāhase rato
daḷhaṃ samādāya samattam acari.

were in Aśoka's *dhamma* some teachings which were meant, it seems, for the recluses living within his domain. He wished them to live a saintly life by practising self-restraint, purity of mind,[1] gratefulness (*kataṃñatā*),[2] by cultivating regard for all sects and by keeping themselves engaged in the preaching of *dharma*. For them self-restraint (*saṃyama*) was more important than gifts and worship,[3] and their gifts should be the gifts of religious instructions (*dhammadāna*).[4]

(v) Rejection of rites and ceremonies as also of Samājas: Aśoka discouraged rites and ceremonies, specially those performed by women on auspicious occasions, or for averting evils. He condemned *Samājas* (festive assemblies), which indirectly gave occasion for "drunkenness, revelry and infatuation" (See Barua, *Inscriptions*, ii, p. 226). It is very likely that Aśoka's dislike of rites and ceremonies was derived from the Buddhist teaching of the avoidance of *śīla-vrata-parāmarśa* (contagion of rules and rituals) and that of *Samājas* from the admonitions found in the *Sīgālovāda-Sutta* (*Dīgha*, iv, p. 163; Cf. *Śivālakasūtra* in the *Mahākarma-vibhaṅga*, p. 56).

1 By *bhāvasuddhi* Aśoka perhaps had in mind *cittasuddhi* (mental purification), a discipline which Buddhism and all other religions insist immediately after *brahmacarya* (physical purity) which is attained by *kāyika* and *vācasika saṃyama*. Bhikkhus attain *citta-suddhi* by means of meditation whereas the laity have it by love (*mettā*) and toleration.

2 Kataṃñatā (=Pāli *Kataññutā*) means gratitude. Bhandarkar explains *Kritajñatā*, as knowing what is right. See his *Aśoka*, p. 321. Cf. *Aṅguttara*. i, p. 61: Kataññū=Katavedī.

3 Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

4 Cf. *Dhammapada:* Dhammadānaṃ sabbadānaṃ jināti.

(vi) Aśoka's toleration: There can be no doubt that though Aśoka was favourably inclined towards the Buddhists, he was not therefore unmindful of the interests of the other religionists. In the Edicts, he harped on the virtue of toleration, which even the Buddhists lacked inspite of Buddha's prohibition of *attukkaṃsanā* (self-praise) and *parapaṃsanā* (other's denunciation). He appointed officers (*dhammamahāmātras*) to look after the interest of the members of all sects (R.E.V.). Their main duty was the promotion of *dharma* among the different sects as also to make money-grants to them. He himself paid visits and made gifts to the brāhmanical and non-brāhmanical ascetics (*samaṇas*) (R.E. VII). But he wanted that all religious men, irrespective of their creed, should freely dwell at all places (R.E. VII) provided they exercised self-restraint, possessed purity of mind and knew what is right. In R.E. XII, he is more explicit regarding toleration. He says that he honoured members of all sects, ascetics, and even non-ascetics (lay-devotees) and he expected that there should be not only absence of sectarian squibbles but also they should meet and try to acquaint themselves with, and if possible appreciate, one another's views. There must be mutual appreciation, and he enjoined his Dharma-mahāmātras to promote it as far as possible. He did not insist that the several sects should agree regarding their ultimate views but they must all be pure in speech, thought and action. (See also P.E. VI). In the seventh Pillar Edict, he specifically mentioned the Ājīvikas, Nirgranthas and the Buddhists (*Saṅgha*), for whose welfare he appointed the Dharma-mahāmātras. It is remarkable that he would not distinguish between ascetics and householders, if the latter be religious. In his opinion all religious men, whether ascetics or not, were good and as such should be looked after for their spiritual development, which he believed,

consisted mainly in the purity of speech, thought and action, and in avoiding self-praise and other's denunciation,[1] in other words, mutual appreciation of one another.

(vii) Aśoka's practical measures: Aśoka did not merely express pious wishes for the moral and spiritual uplift of all religious men. He introduced several practical measures to see that his wishes might be effectively carried out. Some of these measures were, (a) Mandatory orders prohibiting slaughter of animals for sacrifice; (b) Appointment of Dharma-mahāmātras to look after the moral uplift of the people and to give relief to the people in distress; (c) Directing officers like the Yuktas, Rajjukas and Prādesikas to undertake special tours of inspection every five years for propagating his *Dhamma*,[2] and (d) An empire wide organisation to see that the people of his empire as well as those living in border countries might be righteous and become godlike.

(viii) Aśoka's attitude towards Buddhism: Aśoka as the emperor showed toleration to all religions, although he had a personal fancy for Buddhism, and very probably he became a Buddhist upāsaka. In R.E. VIII issued in the 10th year of his reign, Aśoka says that he paid a visit to the *Sambodhi*, by which he probably meant Gayā, the place where Buddha attained *Sambodhi*. In the 14th year of his reign he enlarged the *stūpa* of Kanakamuni, and in the 20th year he worshipped the *stūpa* of Kanakamuni as also the birthplace of Buddha (*Vide* Nigliva Inscr. and Minor Pillar Edict). In the Bhabru edict, he expressed his admiration for Buddha's teachings and recommended certain texts for special study of the

1 Cf. *Majjhima*, I, p. 409: n'ev' attān' ukkaṃseti na paraṃ vambheti.

2 See Barua, *op. cit.*, pp. 181, 254.

monks while in the Sarnath and Sanchi inscriptions, he revealed his solicitude for the well-being and concord of the Saṅgha. In the Allahabad Pillar inscription he directed his officers to avert any schism in the church. Lastly, towards the end of his reign when 256 years had elapsed after the death of Buddha, he admitted that out of the two and a half years that he formally became an Upāsaka, he observed the *śīlas* (i.e., eight *śīlas*) for only one and a half-year,—the period he lived in a monastery with the monks. There is nothing in the inscriptions to show that Aśoka became an ordained monk nor is there any reference in the Buddhist traditions to such a possibility. He remained a lay-devotee, and very likely he resided in a monastery as such for a certain period of time.

CHAPTER XV

THIRD BUDDHIST COUNCIL

It is only in the *Aṭṭhakathās*[1] and the Ceylonese chronicles that we get an acccount of the third Buddhist Council held during the reign of Aśoka. The omission of this Council in the Chinese and Tibetan accounts, in other words, in the texts of the non-Theravāda sects, signifies that it was a sectarian affair, for which it was ignored by all sects except the Theravādins, to be more precise, Theravāda-Vibhajjavāda sect of Ceylon.[2] It is rather remarkable that Hiuen Tsiang or Itsing also has not referred to it though both have mentioned the names of different sects and the spheres of their influence.[3] V. A. Smith (*Early History of India,* 3rd ed., p. 161) dismisses the account of the Ceylonese chronicles as fictitious on account of the fact that it is not mentioned in the Aśokan Pillar edicts. Prof. Kern has doubts about the actual session of the Council, and he thinks that if the Council was at all held, it was only a party meeting. Mrs. Rhys Davids regards the traditional

1 *Samantapāsādikā,* I, p. 53 f.; *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā,* p. 5-6. In the *Cullavagga,* there is no reference to this council. It may be argued by some that the *Cullavagga* was composed before the third council.

2 Cf. *Cullavagga,* p. 72: Ācariyānaṃ Vibhajjapadānaṃ Tambapaṇṇidīpapasādakānaṃ Mahāvihāravāsinaṃ vācanā saddhammaṭṭhitiyā ti.

3 Dr. R. C. Mazumdar thinks that Hiuen Tsiang's account of the rivalry between the heretics and the Buddhists in connection with the Institution of the Gong-Call Tope may have some connection with this Council. See B. C. Law, *Buddhistic Studies,* p. 68-69.

account of the Council as something quite different from what actually took place. In her opinion the Piṭaka was revised by eight monks and not by a thousand, and the expulsion of monks was carried out after the session of the Council. Dr. Thomas is also inclined to take the account of the Council as an invention of the Ceylonese writers.[1] The traditional account of the Council may not be pure history but the circumstances which led to the Council appear to have a historical basis. The breach between the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas took place in the Second Buddhist Council,[2] and it grew wider and wider till it became almost impossible for the two sects to live together in the same *Āvāsa*. The controversies recorded in the *Kathāvatthu* have been corroborated by Vasumitra, Bhavya and others,[3] hence their authenticity cannot be denied. The main business of the Council was the refutation of the doctrines of the more important non-Theravāda schools from the standpoint of the Theravādins. In the Second Buddhist Council the disciplinary rules only were taken exception by the orthodox party, and in this Council interpretation of the doctrines was challenged. From the *Nikāya-saṅgraha* we learn that the Mahāsaṅghikas did not pay heed to the refutations and that they met together at Kosambī to confirm their own views. The refusal of the orthodox monks to hold *Uposatha* with the unorthodox monks appears to be authentic and was very likely the main cause for the session of the Council. After expelling the unorthodox monks, the Theravādins met together to establish the contentions of the Theravādins, and the result was the compilation of the *Kathāvatthu*, which might have been slightly smaller in extent than the present text.

1 E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 35.

2 See above, Ch. V.

3 See above, Chs. VIII-XI.

The Traditional Account

The story of the Council as given in the Chronicles runs as follows: About 200 years after Buddha's death, a large number of non-Buddhists joined the order for the sake of gain. They held unorthodox views in matters of both doctrine and discipline. The orthodox monks refused to perform in their company, the *uposatha* ceremony, one of the primary conditions of which was that the members present must declare at the outset of the assembly that they were pure, and had not committed any breach of the disciplinary rules, or if they had, confessed the same and taken formal absolution. For full seven years, as the Pāli tradition goes, no *uposatha* could be held at Pāṭaliputra. Aśoka deputed one of his ministers to persuade the monks at Aśokārāma to hold the *uposatha*. On the monks' refusal to comply with the king's wishes, the minister had them seated in a row and began to behead them one after another. At this, Aśoka's brother Tissa, who was also a monk, residing in the same monastery, intervened by taking a seat in the row. The minister got puzzled, and approached the king for direction. Aśoka was stunned at the news, for he never thought that his orders would be carried out in the manner his minister did. He approached the monks to ascertain whether he or his minister or both were guilty for the henious act of his minister. He did not get satisfaction at the different answers given by the monks, and so at their advice he decided to invite the oldest and the most learned of the monks of the time, Moggaliputta Tissa, who was then staying in a forest, to the Aśokārāma in order to get his doubts solved by him. Moggaliputta Tissa arrived in due course of time and convinced him of his innocence on the ground of the absence of his intention to have the monks beheaded. At his advice, Aśoka decided

to weed out the unorthodox monks from the Saṅgha. He and Tissa called the monks one by one and asked each of them whether Buddha was a Vibhajjavādin or not? Those who answered in the affirmative were allowed to remain within the Saṅgha while the rest were compelled to give up their yellow robes. After thus purging the Saṅgha of unorthodox elements, a Council was held by the orthodox monks, and in that Council the three Piṭakas were recited as was done in the 1st and 2nd Councils. On this occasion Moggaliputta Tissa composed the *Kathāvatthu*, one of the seven texts of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, with a view to refute the various doctrinal views held by the non-Theravādins.[1]

In the *Nikāya-saṅgraha*, a late Sinhalese work, there is the additional information that the monks who were compelled to leave the Saṅgha of the Theriya Nikāya (=Theravādins) became members of the non-Theravāda sects, particularly the Mahāsaṅghikas. In course of time they became subdivided into nine sub-sects, viz., Hemavata, Rājagiriya, Siddhatthaka (see above, p. 109), Pūrvaśaila, Aparaśaila (see above, p. 74 f.), Vājiriya, Vetullaka, Andhaka and Anya-Mahāsaṅghika. In the *Mahāvaṃsa* the first six sects are mentioned as some of the later schools which came into being after the first eighteen. The Saila schools on account of their location in the Andhra country were also known as the Andhakas (see above, p. 49). The Vetullakas or the Vaitulyas (see above, p. 110) and the Anya-Mahāsaṅghikas referred to in the *Kathāvatthu* as *ekacce Mahāsaṅghikā* (see above, p. 74) were also later offshoots of the Mahāsaṅghikas with stronger pro-Mahāyānic views.

[1] *Mahāvaṃsa*, Ch. V.

By scrutinising the above two traditions, we may draw the following conclusions: —

(i) The heretics (*titthiyas*) are none other than those Buddhists who were Ācariyavādins, i.e., the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots.

(ii) The Ācariyavādins differed from the Theravādins not only in disciplinary rules but also in doctrinal principles.

(iii) Monks holding different views about the Pātimokkha rules could not reasonably agree to perform the *Uposatha* in one *Āvāsa*. According to the Pātimokkha code of every sect all the members present and the absentees by proxy must declare that they had not, during the preceding fortnight, committed any breach of the rules embodied in the Vinaya Code accepted by them. If this condition be strictly enforced, a Theravādin would be impure according to the Mahāsaṅghika Code and *vice versa*. Hence no two sects could hold the *Uposatha* at the same sitting.

(iv) Aśoka not conversant with the Vinaya rules wanted to see that the *uposathas* were held in his Ārāma. He also did not approve of the existence of different sects and probably wanted that they should make up their differences which were in many cases of a minor character.

(v) The main cause of the Council was the disagreement between the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theravādins about the Vinaya rules. The members of the Mahāsaṅghika sect were considered impure by the members of the Theravāda sect, and so the latter wanted to expel the former from the Saṅgha.

(vi) The Mahāsaṅghikas were already a powerful body with a large following. They probably left Magadha to make their seat in the Andhra country.

(vii) Aśoka's anxiety for averting schism in the Buddhist church was very probably created by the differences that existed between the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas.

(viii) It is unlikely that Aśoka sided with the Theravādins as against the Mahāsaṅghikas. Hence Aśoka's part in the Council as recorded in the Ceylonese traditions may be dismissed as imaginary.

(ix) The *Kāthāvatthu* was definitely the outcome of the deliberations of the Council.

(x) Moggaliputta Tissa was the Saṅghatthera of the Theravāda vibhajjavāda sect[1] at the time while Upagupta was the Saṅghatthera of the Sarvāstivādins.[2]

(xi) The Theravāda-vibhajjavādins[3] only, to the exclusion of the adherents of other sects, met together and reaffirmed their acceptance of the Theravāda-Piṭakan collection.

Propagation of the religion

The second part of the Ceylonese tradition about the third council deals with the propagation of Buddhism[4] in different countries. It is said that Moggaliputta Tissa after the termination of the Council despatched nine missionaries to nine different places for the propagation of the religion. The names of the

1 On the basis of the inscription *Sapurisasa Mogaliputasa* in a relic casket found in the Tope no. 2 of the Sanchi group, Dr. Geiger concludes that the tradition about Moggaliputta Tissa is authentic. See his *Translation of the Mahāvaṃsa*, p. xx.

2 It is rather remarkable that in the *Papañcasudanī* (II, p. 139) Majjhantikatthera is described as the *Saṅghatthera* on the day on which the festivity on the completion of Aśoka's monasteries took place.

3 See above, p. 199.

4 *Mahāvaṃsa*, Ch. XII.

monks and the countries to which they were deputed are given as follows: —

(i) Majjhantika (=Madhyāndina)	to Kāśmira-Gandhāra (=Mod. Peshwar and Rawalpindi Districts).[1]
(ii) Mahādeva	to Mahiṣamaṇḍala (=Māhiṣmati, a district south of the Vindhyas).
(iii) Rakkhita	to Vanavāsī (=North Canara).
(iv) Dhammarakkhita (a Yonaka)	to Aparānta (Western Countries like Alor, Broach, and Sopara).
(v) Mahādhammarakkhita	to Mahāraṭṭha (=Mod. Mahārāṣṭra).
(vi) Mahārakkhita	to Yona countries (=the foreign settlements of the N.-W. Frontier Province).
(vii) Majjhima	to Himavanta.
(viii) Soṇa with Uttara	to Suvaṇṇabhūmi.[2]
(ix) Mahinda	to Tambapaṇṇi (=Ceylon).

In the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (p. 61-62) there is a similar tradition about the conversion of different countries. It is as follows: —

(i) Mahākātyāyana	Avantī (with capital Ujjayinī) and other Western countries.
(ii Madhyāndina	Kāśmira.
(iii) Gavāmpati	Suvarṇabhūmi.[2]

1 For identification, see B. C. Law, *Geographical Essays*, p. 69.

2 The identification of Sūvarṇabhūmi (mentioned in the two traditions) with Burma cannot be accepted. We must identify it with a country within India. The association of the name of Gavāmpati with Suvarṇabhūmi indicates that the place is not far from Magadha. In the *Milindapañha*, p. 359, Suvarṇabhūmi is mentioned after Kolapaṭṭana as a seaport.

(iv) Piṇḍola Bharadvāja — Pūrva Videha.

(v) Mahendra — Siṃhala.

(vi) Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra — Surpāraka (=Mod. Sopara).

The author of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* has evidently mixed up the earlier tradition with the later. To the earlier tradition belong Mahākātyāyana (Avantī), Gavāmpati (Suvarṇabhūmi) and Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra (Surpāraka) while to the later belong Madhyāndina (Kāśmīra) and Mahendra (Siṃhala). Though the date of composition of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* is a matter of uncertainty, the tradition preserved by it is authentic.

The question is how far the Ceylonese tradition about the despatch of missionaries to different countries can be relied on. The find of the relic-urn, on the inner and outer lid of which appear the following two inscriptions respectively: *Sapurisa [sa] Majhimasa* and *Sapurisa [sa] Kāsapagotasa Hemavatācariyasa* is a definite proof of the fact that Majjhima with Kassapagotta Thera propagated the religion in the Himalayan countries. In view of the fact that Mahāvihāra became the repository of the Pāli Piṭaka and a centure of the Theravāda sect, we may accept the traditional accounts about the missionary activities of Mahinda in Ceylon as fairly authentic. That the members of the Theravāda sect or the Theriya Nikāya as they are called in the *Nikāya Saṅgraha* (see above, p. 268) were imbued with a missionary spirit is amply corroborated by one of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions (3rd or 4th century A.D.); It runs as follows: —

"*Sidham. Namo Bhagavato.....Raṃño M [āṭha] riputasa....., ācarīyānaṃ Kasmira - Gaṃdhāra - Cīna - Cilāta - Tosali - Avaraṃta - Vaṃga - Vanavāsi - Yava [na]. Da [mila - Pa] lura - Taṃbapaṃṇi - dīpa - pasādakānaṃ theriyānaṃ Taṃbapa (ṃ)*

ṇakānaṃ suparigahe Siripavate Vijayapuriya - puva - disā -bhāge vihāre Cula - Dhaṃmagirīyaṃ cetiyagharaṃ sapaṭa - saṃtharaṃ sacetīyaṃ sava - niyutaṃ kāritaṃ uvāsikāya Bodhisiriya".......

Translation: "Success. Adoration to the Lord Buddha. In the 14th year of King Māṭharīputa..............For the benefit of the masters and of the fraternities (of monks), of Taṃbapaṃṇa (Ceylon) who have converted Kashmir, Gandhāra, Cīna, Cilāta (=Skt. Kirāta), Tosali, Avaraṃta (=Skt. Aparānta), Vaṅga, Vanavāsī, Yavana (?), Damila (?), Palura (?) and the Isle of Taṃbapaṃṇi (Ceylon). At Siripavata (=Śrīparvata) on the east side of Vijayapurī at the Convent on the Lesser Dharmagiri a Caitya hall with a flooring of slabs, with a Caitya and provided with all the necessaries, was caused to be made by the female lay-member Bodhisiri (=Skt. Bodhiśrī) ...." (Dr. Hirananda Sastri in *Epigraphia Indica*, XX, pp. 22, 23). This inscription not only corroborates the Ceylonese tradition that the members of the Theriya Nikāya or the Theravāda sect, who later settled in Ceylon, propagated Buddhism in many countries but also proves that their missionary activity went on unabated and they were able to introduce Buddhism into a few other places, like Cīna(?), Tosali (in Kaliṅga), Vaṅga (Bengal), Palura (Dantapura?) and the Tamil countries. In the other inscriptions discovered at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa the names of a few other Buddhist sects are mentioned but they are not given the credit of taking up actively the task of propagation of the religion. In view of the above quoted inscription of Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and the inscriptions on the lid of the relic-urns, we think the Ceylonese tradition about the despatch of missionaries has a historical basis.

Apart from the propagation made by the Theriya Nikāya we know that several sects which came into Being after the

Second Buddhist Council migrated to different countries from Magadha and each sect selected a centre for itself. The Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, for instance, migrated southwards and came to be known as the Andhakas, whch fact indicates that they propagated Buddhism in the Andhra countries. The Mahīśāsakas and the Theravādins moved together for some time till the former settled in Mahiṣamaṇḍala and Vanavāsi, and the latter in Avantī, and ultimately in Ceylon. The Sammitīyas or the Vātsīputrīyas bore the local name of the Avantakas, and so it seems that this sect selected the northern part of Avantī and Vatsa country as their fields of activities. The Sarvāstivādins proceeded northwards to Mathurā and thence to Gandhāra. Those of the Sarvāstivādins, who proceeded further north to Kāśmīra, were probably the Haimavatas or the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who had the other local name, the Uttarāpathakas.

Thus we see that by the time of Aśoka, Buddhism had spread eastwards and southwards up to the Andhra countries, North Canara and Māhiṣmatī, westwards up to Broach and Sopara, and northwards to the N.-W. Frontier Provinces and Kāśmīra. It was on account of the peaceful state brought about by Aśoka's rule that it was possible for Buddhism to reach all the parts of India and to become a dominant force in the history of religions in India.

CHAPTER XVI

Popular Buddhism

Aśoka as a ruler gave preference to the popular religious ideal, producing good citizens, and not to the spiritual, making the people unsocial. It cannot be ascertained how far Aśoka had a hand in the matter of making Buddhism popular but the history of the religion shows that after the days of Aśoka, it developed new aspects which became so very popular that the reoriented religion spread all over India, marking every notable spot with magnificent structures of rare artistic value, and ultimately reaching countries beyond the borders of India. Early Buddhism of the pre-Aśokan days, though propagated in different provincial dialects, was not appreciated by the common-folk.[1] The insistence on retirement from wordly life was a great handicap in the way of its popularity; so during the first century of its existence, it remained confined to the recluses and monasteries, and hardly reached the home and the hearth. It was perhaps about a century after Buddha's death that the religion became dynamic, assimilating some of the ideas and thoughts current around and stepped down from its high pedestal of exclusiveness and abstruse ideals to appeal to the more intellectual and faithful among the common-folk. This move towards popularity too did not proceed far as we find that it just allowed a little scope for rituals of a sober character, a little of faith and

1 Cf. Grünwedel, *Buddhist Art in India*, p. 67: "Originally, Buddhism was only a philosophy, no religion; but therein consisted the weakness of the Buddha doctrines, which speedily became unpopular on that account."

worship, and a slight relaxation from the stringency of disciplinary rules. There are, in fact, two stages in the course of its attainment of popularity, one of the pre-Aśokan days and other of the post-Aśokan.

I. *Pre-Aśokan Period*

The pre-Aśokan form of the religion provided no scope for emotion, nor for devotion or worship, not to speak of rituals. Its dry-as dust ethical principles and doctrinal teachings based on so-called reason hardly attracted the attention of the common-folk. Among the householders it was only the cultured few like Anāthapiṇḍika and Visākhā, Jīvaka and Āmrapālī, Citta and Nakulapitā who took interest in the religion and worked for its success. Among the recluses and intellectuals also there were not very many who could dive deep into the truths of the religion, and it was probably this lack of appreciation of his teachings that made Buddha hesitate to preach the religion to one and all.

Ecclesiastical Rituals

In course of time, however, there was some accretion of rituals in the form of (i) *trisaraṇa,* (ii) lower and higher ordinations, (iii) observance of *uposatha,* (iv) *vassāvāsa, pavāraṇā,* and *kaṭhina.* These *rituals* attracted some converts of a mediocre type and appreciably helped the enlargement of the body hitherto known as Śākyaputtiya Samaṇas. Around this body grew up a number of house-holders, who impressed by the saintly character of some of the monks as also by the simple ethical teachings of the religion, and the rituals of Trisaraṇa, and other ecclesiastical functions like *Pavāraṇā* requiring the services of laymen, avowed themselves as *upāsakas* and *upāsikās.*[1] It is rather remarkable

that the religion did not yield to the wishes of the mass any further, by providing objects of worship or by allowing the laymen to take any part in the ecclesiastical functions.

(i) *Triśaraṇa.* There was no form of prayer except an expression of faith in the *Triratna.* The three articles of faith, compulsory for every monk and nun or layman and lay-woman was the thrice utterance of the formula,—

(i) *Buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*
(ii) *Dhammaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*
and (iii) *Saṃghaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi.*

There has been a good deal of discussion among the Buddhist[1] scholiasts about the meaning of *saraṇa* and *Buddha, Dharma* and *Saṅgha.* The best and the earliest interpretation is found in a few couplets preserved in the canonical texts.[2] These are.—

बहवः शरणं यान्ति पर्वतांश्च वनानि च ।
आरामंश्चैत्यवृक्षांश्च मनुष्या भयतर्जिताः ॥
न ह्येतच्छरणं श्रेष्ठं नैतच्छरणमुत्तमम् ।
नैतच्छरणमागम्य सर्वदुःखात् प्रमुच्यते ॥
यस्तु बुद्धं च धर्मं संघं च शरणं गतः ।
आर्यसत्यानि चत्वारि पश्यति प्रज्ञया सदा ॥
दुःखं दुःखसमुत्पादं दुःखस्य समतिक्रमम् ।
आर्यं चाष्टाङ्गिकं मार्गं क्षेमं निर्वाणगामिनम् ॥
एतद्धि शरणं श्रेष्ठं एतच्छरणमुत्तमम् ।
एतच्छरणमागम्य सर्वदुःखात प्रमुच्यते ॥

1 See Vol. I, chap. xii.

2 *Dhammapada,* pp. 188-192; *Udānavarga,* xxvii, 28-30; *Divyāvadāna,* p. 164; *Abhidharmakośa,* iv, 80, etc. See L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Doctrine des Refuges,* in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques,* (1931-32), p. 75.

In these couplets, *saraṇaṃ* means 'seeking protection' from evils. In the formulae of *Triratna*, the protection that one seeks is not from the worldly evils but from the suffering to which a human being is destined.[1] Such protection can be secured by developing faith in Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, and by realising the four truths and the eightfold path, and not by leading solitary meditative life in the hills or forests nor by visiting temples and shrines (*caityas*).

The faith in the *Triratna* is usually expressed in these terms:

(i) *Iti pi so Bhagavā arahaṃ sammāsambuddho vijjā-caraṇasampanno sugato lokavidu anuttaro purisadammasārathi satthā devamanussānaṃ.*

(Bhagavā, the enlightened, is endowed with knowledge and good conduct, he is the knower of the world, the guide in disciplining men, the incomparable, the teacher of men and gods).

(ii) *Svakkhāto Bhagavatā dhammo sandiṭṭhiko akāliko ehipassiko opanayiko paccattaṃ veditabbo viññūhi.*

(The Dhamma preached by Bhagavā produces fruit in his life, invites everybody, has no limitation of time, leads one to the goal and is realisable only by the wise within one's ownself).

(iii) *Supaṭipanno Bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho yad idam cattāri purisayugāni aṭṭhapurisapuggalā, esa Bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho āhuṇeyyo pāhuṇeyyo dakkhiṇeyyo añjalikaraṇīyo anuttaraṃ puññkkhettaṃ lokassa.*

[1] *Sumaṅgala Vilāsini*, I, p. 230.

(The Saṅgha consists of monks, who are in one of the four stages of sanctification, are righteous, exerting for knowledge, observing good conduct, who are worthy of gifts, praise and respects, and who are fit recipients of gifts from laymen).

The Buddhist scholiasts[1] who were imbued with the principles of early Buddhism, were at a loss to justify the avowal of these three articles of faith. Some of them, who looked upon Buddha's mortal body as impure, said that 'Buddha' in the formulae implied a collection of *dharmas* and not Buddha the individual; *Dharma* implied the last two truths only viz., *duḥkha-nirodha* and the *aṣṭāṅgikamārga,* which are pure, and not the other two which are impure *dharmas.* Saṅgha in the formulae implied *śīlas* or the mortal duties which make a person an *arhat,* and not merely a member of the order. It is doubtful how far this interpretation of the scholiasts appealed to the common-folk. We know that the utterance of the *Tri-saraṇa* formulae was made compulsory for both monks and laity, and that this utterance alone transformed a non-Buddhist to a

1 See L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques,* (1931-32). In the *Jñānaprasthāna sūtra,* we find the following exposition: —

(i) The real *dharmas,* which have for name or appellation or designation the expression 'Buddha'—those who take refuge in the *Aśaikṣadharmas,* which make the Buddha, are said to take refuge in Buddha.

(ii) The real *dharmas,* which have for their name, appellation or designation the word 'Dharma'—those who take refuge in the removal of thirst, i.e., destruction, detachment, Nirvāṇa, are said to have taken refuge in Dharma.

(iii) The real *dharmas,* which have for their name, appellation or designation the word 'Saṃgha'—those who take refuge in both the *Śaikṣa* and *Aśaikṣa-dharmas,* are said to have taken refuge in the Saṃgha.

Buddhist.[1] Hence, we may safely state that these three articles of faith served as a means of popularising the religion, and these were also looked upon as spells (*paritta*) for protection from evils or evil destiny.

The utterance of the *Trisaraṇa* is usually followed nowadays by taking the vow of observing the first five *śīlas* and then by chanting the *Maṅgala Sutta*. In the canonical texts, however, there is no indication of this procedure.

(ii) *Uposatha*. It is admitted in the Vinaya[2] that the idea of holding fortnightly meeting was suggested to Buddha by Bimbisāra whose object was that the monks should deliver religious discourses to the people at large on certain days of the month. These assemblies however soon turned into ritualistic institutions, requiring monks to be present at the meetings and confess their sins, if any committed during the preceding fortnight, after the formal recital of the Pātimokkha rule.[3] This ceremony undoubtedly gave satisfaction to a class of monks who viewed the observance of Pātimokkha rules as more important than the inner spiritual development and attracted some men of the mediocre type.

(iii) *Pabbajjā* and *Upasampadā*. The ceremony of ordination was originally a very simple affair. It was done by Buddha by the mere utterance of *ehi bhikkhu*. Gradually it turned into a fairly long ceremony with two ordinations, one lower (*pabbajjā*) and the other higher (*upasampadā*).[4] This ceremony, which required shaving of head, donning of yellow robes and living in a monastery, attracted some men who could not fully

1 See *ante.*, ch. XII.
2 *Vinaya*, i, p. 617.
3 For details, see Vol. I, pp. 289-f.
4 *Ibid.*, pp. 280-281.

comprehend the philosophical teachings. In the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* there are also some hints about the gains and honour received by an ordained person, e.g. it is said that the immediate gain of a person, whatever his status might be before his ordination, is that he is respected by kings and nobles, and obtains robes, food, bed, medicine and other requisites.[1]

(iv) *Vassāvāsa, Pavāraṇā* and *Kaṭhina.*[2] The other ceremonial functions which gradually crept into the religion were the formal observance of the rainy season retreat. The monks were required to stay during the three months of the rainy season at a fixed abode. At the close of the retreat, the monks performed the *Pavāraṇā* ceremony, which is similar to the *Uposatha,* but on account of the occasion on which it is performed, special importance was attached to it, and householders were told that gifts made on this particular occasion were more meritorious than at other times. With this *Pavāraṇā* ceremony was associated another ceremony called *Kaṭhina* in which the making of robes formed the chief object. These two ceremonies *Pavāraṇā* and *Kaṭhina* served to popularise the religion not only among those who wanted to join the order but also among the householders, who patiently waited for these days for making their gifts, particularly robes, and thereby assured their happiness in this existence and rebirth in the heavens.

The ceremonies mentioned above were no doubt useful for the spiritual development of a person, but strictly speaking, were not in consonance with the principles laid down for the attainment of spiritual perfection. It has got to be admitted that these ceremonies were introduced in imitation of, or com-

1 *Dīgha,* i. p. 61-62. 2 For details, see Vol. I, p. 292-3.

petition with, other contemporary religious systems in order to secure more converts, and it is not improbable that by these ceremonies, the religion attracted more men than it would otherwise have done.

Worship of Cetiya and Stūpa

Neither in the *Vinaya* nor in the *Sutta-piṭaka,* except the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* there is any direction for making and worshipping *Cetiyas* and *Stūpas.* In the *Vinaya* there is mention of two Cetiyas[1] where Buddha stopped, while in the *Pāṭikasuttanta*[2] as also in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta,*[3] there are references to the Cetiyas situated around Vesāli, viz., Gotamaka-cetiya on the south, Sattamba-cetiya on the west, Bahuputta-cetiya on the north. The other Cetiyas mentioned in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* are Udena, Sarandada, Cāpāla,[4] Ānanda,[5] (in Bhoganagara), and Makuṭabandhana[6] of the Mallas.

From the list of cetiyas given above, it is apparent that long before Buddhism made its appearance, there was the prevalence of worship of *cetiyas,* which might be a tree, a stone and a spot believed to be sanctified or haunted by a good or evil spirit.[7] The existence of Cetiyas is taken as an admitted fact by Buddha himself.

Apart from the Cetiyas, there was also the ancient custom

1 *Vinaya,* i, p. 35: Supatiṭṭha cetiya near Rājagaha; ii, p. 172: Aggāḷavacetiya at Ālavi.

2 *Dīgha,* iii, p. 9-10.

3 *Ibid.,* ii, pp. 102-3, 118.

4 *Ibid.*

5 *Ibid.,* pp. 123, 126.

6 *Ibid.,* p. 160-1.

7 See the gāthās cited above p. 277-8. Also, Gisbert Combaz, *L'evolution du stūpa en Asie* in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques,* ii (1932-33), pp. 168 ff.

of erecting mounds (*stūpas*) on the relics of saintly persons or distinguished kings, princes and nobles as also over the sites sanctified by a saint's presence. It was this ancient custom which we find re-iterated in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*. Buddha is made to say that *stūpas* should be erected on the relics of (i) a Tathāgata, (ii) a Paccekabuddha, (iii) a Tathāgatasāvaka and (iv) a monarch (*cakkavatti*) evidently with a view to make the Buddhists refrain from erecting and worshipping any mound sanctified by a spirit or a non-Buddhist saint. The most suitable site recommended for the erection of *stūpa*, is the crossing of four highways. Worship of such four kinds of *stūpas* by garlands, scents, or coloured powders was regarded as meritorious, as it gave an expression to one's deep faith in the religion. Along with these directions, there is the description of the manner in which the earthly remains of a Tathāgata should be cremated. The erection of *stūpas* over Buddha's relics has created history, and even today the sight of the relics deposited in some of the monasteries is a matter of awe and inspiration to the devotees.

The whole account of the erection and worship of *stūpas*, particularly over Buddha's relics and the merit accruing therefrom was undoubtedly incorporated into the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* after Buddha's demise and had nothing to do with the great Teacher, who evidently could not have thought of what would become of his relics and who would be their claimants. This idea of erection and worship of *stūpas* was undoubtedly a post-Buddha development. The interpolator, who put in the directions for worshipping *cetiyas* and held out the hope that by such worship one would be reborn in the heavens, realised the inconsistency with the principles of the religion, and immediately corrected himself by adding the remark that

the advanced monks were not to occupy themselves with such worship of *stūpas*, and that they must exert to attain the goal while the worship of *stūpas* should be left to the laity alone, the wise brāhmaṇas, khattiyas and gahapatis.[1] The traditions about Aśoka's zeal to collect the relics and erect *stūpas* over them[2] also prove that the stūpa-worship became widely prevalent. It is very likely that by Aśoka's time, the stūpa-worship became a regular feature of the religion.[2]

Four Places of Pilgrimage

Like the worship of *cetiyas* and *stūpas*, it must be sometime after Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* that the idea of pilgrimage came into the minds of some Buddhist monks, at whose instance, some imaginary discourses attributed to Buddha were incorporated into the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*. A religious teacher like Buddha, who was all along averse to any form of worship[3] and taught *attadīpo attasaraṇo anaññasaraṇo dhammadīpo dhammasaraṇo anaññasaraṇo*[4] (depend on your own self as the light, as the refuge and not on anything else; depend on the *dhamma* as the light, as the refuge and not on anything else) could not have admonished his disciples to earn merit by visiting the four places sanctified by his (i) birth, (ii) attainment of bodhi, (iii) promulgation of *dhammacakka* and (iv) *parinirvāṇa*. The inconsistency is at once

1 *Dīgha*, ii, p. 141.

2 See the account in the *Divyāvadāna*, pp. 389 ff.

3 *Dīgha*, ii, p. 138: *Na kho Ānanda ettavatā Tathāgato sakkato vā hoti garukato vā mānito vā pūjito vā apacito vā* etc.

4 Cf. *Mahāvastu*, X, p. 334. Also compare

आत्मा हि आत्मनो नाथः को नु नाथः परो भवेत् ।
आत्मना हि सुदान्तेन स्वर्गं प्राप्नोति पण्डितः ॥

quoted in the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, p. 483.

apparent in the fact that one of the places recommended for visit is the site of his demise. Hence, there can be no doubt that the idea of pilgrimage was not that of Buddha but was of his disciples and of a time when Buddha had passed away. The idea, however, caught the imagination of the people, particularly, of the lay-disciples. The most remarkable an instance is that of Aśoka who paid a visit to the birthplace of Buddha, evidently with the hope of earning some merit. Throughout the history of Buddhism since the days of Aśoka, the idea of pilgrimage appealed strongly to the Buddhists, both monks and laymen, and even today the Buddhist devotees from far off countries like Burma and Ceylon, China and Japan regard this pilgrimage as an act of great merit.

Nirvāṇa through Faith

In the earliest form of monastic Buddhism the only means recommended for the attainment of emancipation was perfection in the *sīlacitta-paññā* practices.[1] Occasionally perfection in the *satipaṭṭhāna* practices was recognised as another means for reaching the goal,[2] but nowhere *saddhā* and practice of *brahmavihāra* were recognised as such. It is therefore striking that we should find in the *Majjhima Nikāya* a discourse[3] in which *saddhā* is made the basic, and perfection in the *brahmavihāras* as the ultimate, factors for the attainment of *Nirvāṇa.* This new path, which attached less importance to the observance of the Pātimokkha rules, was definitely a step towards making the religion popular among a certain section of the people, who were not able to lead the life of a bhikkhu.

1 See Vol. I, pp. 199 f.

2 *Majjhima*, i, p. 55: Ekāyano ayaṃ bhikkhave maggo sattānaṃ visuddhiyā yad idaṃ cattāro satipaṭṭhanā.

3 Vatthupamasutta, *Majjhima*, i, p. 36 f.

Saddhā (faith),[1] as expressed in the formulae *Trisaraṇa*,[2] is mentioned as an essential element for spiritual progress, but that *saddhā* was looked upon only as an antidote to inclination to non-Buddhist religious faith. It was an antidote to *vicikicchā* or doubt about the greatness of Buddha, excellence of his teaching and uprightness of his disciples. In the *Vatthupamasutta*,[3] the process of attainment of *Nibbāna* through *saddhā* is detailed thus:—

(i) An adept should first get rid of the mental impurities, such as *abhijjhā* (undue desire for gain), *macchariya* (miserliness), *makkha* (hypocrisy), *māyā* (decitfulness) *sāṭheyya* (double-dealing), *thambho-sārambho* (pride and haughtiness), *māno-atimāno* (conceit and over-conceit), *mada* (pride or excitement caused by attachment to one's own acquisitions), and *pamāda* (carelessness).

(ii) After the removal of the above-mentioned impurities, the adept is required to develop unflinching faith (*saddhā*) in the *Triratna*.

(iii) The more the mental impurities are removed the stronger becomes his faith (*saddhā*) in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. Such faith produces in his mind the satisfaction that he has achieved something good. Such satisfaction in turn produces joy and deep pleasure (*pīti*) which makes the body calm and the mind serene, and ultimately leads to mental concentration.

1 For an exhaustive exposition of *Saddhā*, see B. M. Barua, 'Faith in Buddhism' in *Buddhistic Studies*, p. 329.

Cf. Saddhāya tarati oghaṃ appamādena aṇṇavaṃ
viriyena dukkhaṃ acceti paññāya parisujjhati.
Suttanipāta, v. 184.

2 See above, p. 278.

3 *Majjhima*, i, p. 36 f.

(iv) After developing perfect concentration of mind, the adept is required to practise the four *brahmavihāras*, in other words, he must practise *mettā* (love), *karuṇā* (compassion), *muditā* (feeling of joy at others' success) and *upekkhā* (equanimity) towards all beings of all corners of the world.[1]

(v) After attaining perfection in the four *brahmavihāras*, the adept realises the four truths, removes the three impurities (*āsavas*) viz., *kāma* (desire), *bhava* (desire for rebirth) and *avijjā* (ignorance of the truth). He then feels convinced that he has completed his task, and will have no more rebirth, i.e., he attains *Nirvāṇa*. Thus we see that by *saddhā* and *brahmavihāra* one could achieve *Nibbāna* and this path could be taken by the householders as there was no question of renunciation or observance of Pātimokkha rules. This new process was really a move to make the religion popular among the householders and a product of a time in between Buddha and Aśoka.

It may be argued that *saddhā* is not devotion (*bhakti*)[2] and hence it has no fitting place in the popular form of the religion. There is some force in this argument, but what is needed to be pointed out is that *saddhā* eliminates the long process of observance of *śīlas*, i.e., the *pātimokkha* rules, and the process dealt with above eliminates many of the arduous tasks imposed upon a monk to attain perfection in the four *jhānas*, and to comprehend the *anattā* and *anicca* theories. It brings a new element, the *brahmavihāras*, which so far had no place in early Buddhism. In short, it is a new and shorter process suited to a person who is not necessarily a monk or nun, and that it was meant so is clear from the remarks in the above mentioned

1 See *infra* and Vol. I, p. 228 f.

2 Contrast Har Dayal's remarks in his *Bodhisattva Doctrine*, p. 32.

sutta that a person taking recourse to this new process may take luxurious food as that of a householder and that it would not stand in his way of attaining the goal. This is significant of the fact that the process was intended more for the laity than for the recluses, and actually we find this particular course recommended to the householder, Mahānāma,[1] who was addressed by Buddha in these words: "O Mahānāma, when you bear in mind that you have unflinching faith in the *Triratna,* when you realise that you have observed the precepts fully, when you are convinced that you are great in charity and when you feel assured that you possess *saddhā, sīla, suta, cāga* and *paññā* as that of the gods, you would surely be reborn as a god. Again, when your mind becomes free from attachment (*rāga*), hatred (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*) and you will feel that you have achieved something good, you will have joy and serene pleasure, which in turn will make your body calm and at ease and your mind will get concentrated." In another discourse[2] the same Mahānāma was told that an upāsaka by firm faith could become quick-witted (*hāsapaññā javanapaññā*) and attain emancipation by the realisation of *akiñcaññā* (desirelessness whether for heavenly life or Nibbāna), *suññatā* (essencelessness of worldly objects) and *animittatā* (characteristiclessness of worldly objects). In the *Majjhima Nikāya,*[3] however, it is pointed out that some monks by *saddhā* attain the Anāgāmi stage only, because they regard Bhagavā as omniscient and that his teaching excellent and they exert strenuously so that their bodies become dried up into skin, bones and sinews. It seems, therefore, that *saddhā* gradually rose in the estimation of the

1 *Aṅguttara,* v. pp. 320-332.

2 *Saṃyutta,* v, pp. 376 f.

3 *Majjhima,* i, p. 480-481.

Buddhist monks and came to be recognised as a means to the goal. The importance of *saddhā* in the life of laymen has already been dealt with; it assured them rebirth in one of the heavens, and it was only a step further that *saddhā* combined with the perfection in *brahmavihāras* brought them full emancipation.

The early Buddhists were aware of the practice of *brahmavihāras,* which they classed as *appamaññas* (immeasurables). By this practice one developed a sublime mental state,—in which, he could look upon all beings of the world with the same feeling of love and compassion as one would have towards his son;—in which, he felt happy at the spiritual or material success of every person, be he a friend or foe; and —in which, he remained unmoved by weal or woe. The *brahmavihāras,* however, were not included in the list of thirty-seven *bodhipakkhiya* and other *dhammas* which Buddha declared as his own teaching.[1] In the *Visuddhimagga,* their place is given after the four *jhānas* (meditations) and before the four *samāpattis* (higher trances),[2] but in any case, their practice was not regarded as compulsory for the attainment of Nibbāna. The trend of the remarks in the Pāli texts[3] is that their practice led to rebirth in one of the Brahmalokas only, i.e., the highest form of existence in the constituted sphere, in other words, it did not conduce to Nibbāna. These remarks point to the fact that practice of *brahmavihāras* did not form a part of original Buddhism.

Mrs. Rhys Davids, it seems, was justified in writing that it was taught by the "unknown co-founder of Buddhism."[4]

1 *Majjhima,* ii p. 11 f.
2 See Vol. I, p. 228 f.
3 *Majjhima,* ii, p. 76; *Dīgha* i, p. 251; *Anguttara,* ii, p. 129.
4 C. A. F. Rhys Davids, *Gotama,* p. 180; *JRAS.,* 1928, p. 271.

The fact that these practices appear also in the *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali leads us to infer that these originated among the non-Buddhist or pre-Buddhist thinkers. The nature of mental practices envisaged in the *brahmavihāras* also suggests that these were meant more for the householders than for the recluses. In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*[1] the practice of *brahmavihāras* is given a place next to the *pāramitās*. While in the *Mahāvastu*[2] it is stated that a monk can attain *nirvāṇa* by practising the four *brahmavihāras*. In the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, the practice of *brahmavihāras* is placed next to the four *dhyānas* in the exercises prescribed for the attainment of the third *bhūmi*.[3] A bodhisattva is expected to continue this practice of four *brahmavihāras* up to the seventh *bhūmi*,[4] in which he realises the *tathatā*, and goes beyond the training stage.

Relaxation of Disciplinary Rules

There is a hint, in the path of *saddhā* and *brahmavihāra*, that for the attainment of Nirvāṇa, one need not always be a strict observer of the monastic rules of discipline (see above). Buddha no doubt laid more emphasis on the control of the mind than on the control of body and speech,[5] though it was far from his intenton that his followers should show laxity in observing monastic rules. A century after Buddha's death, appeared the Mahāsaṅghikas who put a new interpretation on Buddha's directions, and set on foot a movement against the rigid orthodoxy of the earlier disciples, whose over-zealousness for the

1 p. 142. 2 iii, p. 421.

3 *Aspects of Mahāyāna*, etc. p. 267.

4 *Ibid.*, Ch. IV.

5 *Majjhima*, i, p. 372: Imesaṃ tiṇṇaṃ kammānaṃ evam paṭivibhattānaṃ manokammaṃ mahāsāvajjataraṃ paññāpemi.

observance of monastic rules led to the sacrifice of essentials. It is an indication that a group of thinkers attached more value to the purification of body and mind and the study of logic than to the punctillious observance of Vinaya rules. We have on the authority of Paramārtha, the following statement attributed to the Kaukulikas an off-shoot of the Mahāsaṅghikas that "a bhikṣu may or may not have three robes for covering his body; may or may not reside in a monastery; and may or may not take his meal within the time limit. The Vinaya rules about residence and food were abrogated by Buddha; it is clear that the real teaching of Buddha was not Vinaya but the study of the logical principles (*nyāya*),[1] i.e., Abhidharma." According to the Dharmaguptas, the Prātimokṣa rules were lost when the *saddharma* disappeared hence there are no more rules, *sīmābandha* and *karmānta*.[2]

It is not improbable that this new viewpoint attracted a large number of recruits and helped to increase its followers. The relaxation in the monastic rules, of course, had nothing to do with the laity, and so whatever appeal, it could have. was confined to the monks and nuns.

We may now sum up the factors that made Buddhism popular in the pre-Aśokan period thus:—

(i) *Trisaraṇa* came to be regarded as the three articles of faith.

(ii) The ecclesiastical ceremonies gave satisfaction to the less philosophically minded disciples.

(iii) Worship of *Caityas* and *Stūpas* allowed some scope for the expression of devotion (*bhakti*).

1 See Paul Demieville, *L'origine des sects bouddhiques* in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, vol. I, (1931-32), pp. 19, 46.

2 *Abhidharmakośa*, iv. 39.

(iv) Visits to the four places of pilgrimage were looked upon as attractive means of earning merit.

(v) *Saddhā* and *brahmavihāra* practices were regarded by some persons as the simpler and shorter means for the attainment of Nibbāna. And lastly,

(vi) Relaxation in the stringency of the Vinaya rules appealed to a class of persons who did not approve the rigid orthodoxy of the earlier schools of disciples.

II. *Post-Aśokan Period*

The few deviations from the earliest principles of Buddhism dealt with above were hardly enough to make the religion popular. The persons who took to *saddhā* and *brahmavihāra* path for emancipation were few and far between; the emphasis was still on the monastic life. The cult of *cetiya-* and *stūpa-*worship made very little progress and the householders with their *Triśaraṇa* and other rituals still remained outside the Buddhist fold as mere suppliers of material needs of the monks and nuns and as faithful listeners to the moral discourses delivered to them by the monks on certain occasions. The Aśokan edicts reveal no change in this austere attitude of the early Buddhists—the only relieving feature being that Aśoka favoured the view that the people should not care very much for recluse-life and should perform good deeds (*kuśalakarma-pathas*) to ensure them an after-life in the heavens. Hence we may say that the real move to make the religion popular among the common-folk was taken after Aśoka. This movement consisted mainly in the following five directions:—

(i) Deification of Buddha.

(ii) Compilation of Jātaka-literature.

(iii) Sanction of Image-worship.

(iv) Introduction of Pāramitā-cult. And

(v) Promulgation of Bodhisattva Doctrine.

Deification of Buddha

In the pre-Aśokan days, Buddha had already come to be looked upon as the highest god superior to Brahmā, Viṣṇu or Śiva. This deification should be attributed first to the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Andhakas, and then to the Sarvāstivādins. It has been shown[1] while discussing the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas and their off-shoots that Buddha had been given all the attributes of the highest god, whose apparitional body occasionally appeared in this world. This body took birth as Siddhārtha Gautama, went through all the ways of a householder and ultimately renounced the world to become a saint just in order to follow the ways of the world (*lokānuvartana*).[2] Buddha was supramundane (*lokottara*) and was made of pure *dharmas*. Everything of the great *ṛṣi* was transcendental including his advent into the world. In the *Mahāvastu*, he is described thus:—

लोकोत्तरा भगवतो चर्या लोकोत्तरं कुशलमूलम् ।
गमनं स्थितं निषण्णं शयितं लोकोत्तरं मुनिनो ॥
यत् तत् सुगतशरीरं भवते भवस्य बन्धनक्षयकरणम् ।
लोकोत्तरं तदपि भो इत्यत्र न संशयः कार्यो ॥
चीवरधरणं मुनिनो लोकोत्तरं अत्र संशयो नास्ति ।
आहाराहरणमथो लोकोत्तरमेव सुगतस्य ॥
देशना नरनागानां सर्वलोकोत्तरा मता ।
यथातथं प्रवक्ष्यामि माहात्म्यं वरबुद्धिनाम् ।
देशकालवशं प्राप्य परिपाकं च कर्मणः ।
सत्यं वा अभिनिर्वृतं धर्मं देशेन्ति नायकाः ॥

1 See *ante*, pp. 63, 75 f.

2 *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 167-8.

लोकानुवर्तनां बुद्धा अनुवर्तन्ति लौकिकीम् ।
प्रज्ञप्तिमनुवर्तन्ति यथा लोकोत्तरामपि ॥ etc.

The above and other passages in the *Mahāvastu* leave no room for doubt that about the time of its composition (i.e., 2nd century B.C.),[1] Buddha had already become the highest god, at least, to a large section of the Buddhists.

The account of Buddha's life in the *Lalitavistara*, the accredited text of the Sarvāstivādins, does not extol Buddha so much as has been done in the *Mahāvastu*. It is more realistic though it attributes divine and super-divine qualities to the Teacher. It says that Buddha while staying in the womb of his mother was enclosed in a casket and from there he delivered discourses to the gods who paid him visits.[2] After his birth, he appeared to dwell at the same moment in all the houses built for him by the faithful. He paid the customary visit to the temples but the gods therein bowed down to him. In his boyhood, he was so learned that the teacher staggered in his presence. In his youth, he possessed already all the kingly powers and skill and surpassed everybody in strength. In this text,[3] he is eulogized thus:—

जातस्य मह्य इय कम्पितः त्रिसहस्रः ।
शक्रश्च ब्रह्मा सुराश्च महोरगाश्च ॥
चन्द्रश्च सूर्य तथ वैश्रवणः कुमारो ।
मूर्द्धाक्रमेषु निपतित्व नमस्ययन्ते ॥
कतमोऽन्य देव मम उत्तरियो विशिष्टो ।
यस्मिन् मम प्रणयसे त्वमिहाद्य अम्ब ॥

1 Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, II, p. 247.
2 Cf. also *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 214.
3 R. L. Mitra, *Lalitavistara*, pp. 136, 142.

देवातिदेव अहू उत्तम सर्वदेवैः ।
देवो न मेऽस्ति सदृशः कुत उत्तरी वा ॥
लोकानुवर्तन प्रतीत इति अम्ब यास्ये ।
दृष्ट्वा विकुर्वित ममा जनता उदग्रा ॥
अधिमात्र गौरव करिष्यति विचित्रकारो ।
ज्ञास्यन्ति देवमनुजा स्वयमेव देवः ॥

— — — —

शास्त्राणि यानि प्रचरन्ति च देवलोके
संख्या लिपिश्च गणनाऽपि च धातुतन्त्रम् ।
ये शिल्पयोग पृथुलौकिक अप्रमेया-
स्तेष्वेषु शिक्षितु पुरा बहुकल्पकोट्यः ॥
किन्तू जनस्य अनुवर्तनतां करोति
लिपिशालामगतु सुशिक्षित-शिक्षणार्थम् ।
परिपाचनार्थं बहुदारक अग्रयाने
अन्यांश्च सत्त्वनियुतानमृते विनेतुम् ॥

Though this text maintains a more sober outlook than the *Mahāvastu,* there is no doubt that Buddha was regarded by the Sarvāstivādins as a divine being though not the highest god. Though he was proficient in everything, he followed the ways of the world to educate the people. The time of composition of this work, according to Winternitz, spread over a long period commencing from the early Christian eras.[1] It may

1 See Winternitz, *op. cit.*, p. 255-6: "It is therefore only correct to say that the *Lalitavistara* offers us very old traditions concerning the Buddha legend, as well as some which are centuries later"........."It is, however, most informative as regards the development of the Buddha legend from its earliest beginnings when only the chief events in the life of the great founder of the religion are adorned with miracles, down to that boundless deification of the Master, in which, from the beginning to the end of his career he appears mainly as a god above all gods."

therefore be safely stated that in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., a certain section of the Buddhists regarded Buddha as the highest god while another section as a great divine being, endowed with all possible virtues and knowledge.

We need not discuss the conception of the Sthaviravādins, who tried to maintain even at this day that Buddha was after all a human saint but with attributes surpassing those of the gods and that in purity and knowledge he was the highest of all constituted beings.[1] This school of thought maintained the realistic conception throughout its long history but it did not gain the same amount of popularity as the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Sarvāstivādins did in the southern and northern parts of India respectively. However realistic the Theravādins might have been, they had to yield to the popular demand of Buddha-worship, and in course of time they allowed the placing of images of Buddha in their temples, and in one of their late texts the *Mahāvaṃsa*, there is also an elaborate description as to how the first image of Buddha was made and how grand were the ceremonies and festivals for putting up the image.

Image-Worship

In the *Mahāvastu* and the *Lalitavistara* Buddha is deified but there are no directions for making images of Buddha. The earliest literary evidence relating to image-making is yielded by the *Divyāvādāna*, in which Aśoka is found to be consulting Piṇḍola Bharadvāja regarding the features (*mahāpuruṣa-*

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 171:—
Sabbābhibhu sabbavidu'ham asmi
sabbesu dhammesu anupalitta
sabbaṃjaho taṇhakkhaye vimutto
sayam abhiññāya kam uddiseyyam. Cf. *Mahāvastu*, iii, p. 326.

lakṣaṇa) of the image.[1] In the *Mahāvaṃsa*[2] too is recorded a similar attempt of Aśoka who consulted the Nāga king for an account of the image. One need not be so credulous as to take these traditions as authentic, but the fact is that the practice of image-worship was taken up by the Buddhists sometime before the 4th century A.D. about which time the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mahāvaṃsa* were composed. We may now pass on to the monumental evidences. In the Sanchi and Barhut sculptures there are no images of Buddha. The most significant fact is that the seats of Buddha are shown as vacant. The earlier methods of indicating Buddha's place in a scene were by depicting his Vajrāsana, Bodhi tree or *pādukā* (wooden slippers) or stūpa. If the date of Sanchi and Barhut sculptures be placed in the 2nd and 1st century B.C. we have to admit that image-worship did not prevail at that period. The practice of image-worship therefore came into vogue about the 1st or 2nd century A.D. at the earliest. The Amarāvati sculptures, belonging to the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, are studded with numerous Buddha-images but the dates of these sculptures are placed by the archaeologists in the 2nd century A.D.[3]

Though the image of Buddha is wanting in the earlier sculptures there are ample evidences to show the wide prevalence of symbol worship. The artists probably did not make an image of the omniscient refulgent Buddha with all the signs of great men (*mahāpuruṣa*), but the feeling of adoration to Buddha was there, and this they expressed by concourse of men and gods and even animals, bowing down reverentially to

1 *Divyāvadāna*, p. 400. 2 *Mahāvaṃsa*, p. 37.

3 *Buddhist Remains in Andhra*, etc. by K. R. Subramanian, 1932, p. 15.

the stūpas, Bodhi-tree or the Vajrāsana, or offering flowers and garlands. In the post-Christian eras, however, the Buddha images not only came into vogue, but practically the Buddhist centres were flooded with such images, some of the most exquisite Gandharan art while others of indigenous local developments. Merit accrued to both the artist and the donor of an image, and so it was quite natural there should be such an exuberance of Buddha-images in the post-Christian eras. Both the Hīnayānists and the Mahāyānists started making images and temples and decorated the *stūpas* with countless images.

Jātakas and Avadānas

In the *Mahāvastu* and the *Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtra* we have not only a biography of Buddha but also a number of stories dealing with Buddha's supposed previous existences as also other traditions. The underlying object of the stories of Buddha's previous births is to show that each event in this life was the result of a past deed of his. These stories served not only to establish the law of *karma* which Buddhism had borrowed from the pre-Buddhistic thoughts but also to convince the common-folk that any act of theirs would similarly be fruitful, and it may be that some of them might sow the seeds of merit like Siddhārtha Gautama and ultimately attain Buddhahood. In the latter case, they would be Bodhisattvas as was Siddhārtha Gautama in his previous lives. The *Lalitavistara* refers to the meritorious deeds performed by him in his previous existences[1] but

1 *Lalitavistara* (R. L. Mitra), p. 192:—
पुरि तुम सुपुरुष ऋषिवर यदभूर्षि ज तव उपगतु भव मम शरणम् ।
भवि ऋषिं जिनवर नररिपु उपने त्वंजि स्वय स्वकि तनु न च जिन त्यजसि ॥
स्मर ऋषि उपगतु पुरि द्रुमनिलये रुचि भवि तववच कति इम गवये ।
सुविदित हिमगिरि यत्र तहि विप्रसा तप तव भविताय समगिर रचिता ॥

does not give the stories in detail which were to be found partly in the Vinaya piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins, and partly in the Avadāna collections. The biographies, and particularly the Jātakas, made a strong appeal to the mass, kindled their devotion and gave them an opportunity to express the same by depicting the stories indelibly on stone. These made them feel within their innermost heart that Buddhahood for them was not an impossibility as had so long been preached by the early Buddhists. The task, of course, was arduous and the path long covering several existences and entailing extreme self-sacrifices. This literature therefore gave a new and forceful impetus to the mass, and paved the way for the glorious days which Buddhism had for a long time in the early Christian eras. Observing the effect of the Jātaka stories on the mass, the Sarvāstivādins began to multiply them and produced large collections of these, calling them Avadānas. They incorporated in it stories dealing with the previous birth not only of Buddha but also of his noted disciples. The puritanic Theravādins could not help following them and started making a collection of stories without intermingling them with the biography of Buddha. They however supplied the events of the present life by way of introduction (*paccuppannavatthu*) and ended the stories by identifying the characters with Buddha and other persons. The object of all these collections was identical, viz., the edification of the mass and popularisation of the religion.

Strangely enough all these *Jātakas* and *Avadānas* are non-Buddhist in character. This have nothing to do with the fundamental teachings of Buddhism—there is not a word about soul, component elements of a being, law of causation, *ātman, skandhas, paṭiccasamuppada* or *nirvāṇa*. These stories deal in a general way with moral virtue but not with the *śīlas,* as de-

tailed in the Piṭakas. These speak highly of a retired life but do not discountenance the life of a householder. On the contrary, the stories are concerned mainly with the social life of the householders and not with the unsocial life of a recluse. These do not breathe a word about monks or their life in monasteries. If not for the use of the term 'Bodhisattva' in every story, the collections could not have been recognised as forming a part of the Buddhist literature. It is really a universal literature dealing with universal moral principles, and a large number of the stories belongs to the common heritage of the Indians of the pre-Aśokan period. These stories teach more altruistic moral principles than negative ethical ideals (*veramaṇis*) as was the practice with the Buddhists. The stories well-known to the common folk of the then age were found to be a convenient medium for propagating the Bodhisattva conception and along with it the greatness of the Teacher.

Pāramitā-cult

The Jātaka-stories, according to the late Buddhist traditions, had in view Bodhisattva's attainment of perfection[1] in six or ten virtues, viz., (i) liberality (*dāna*) (ii) righteousness (*śīla*) (iii) forbearance or endurance (*kṣānti*) (iv) mental strength (*vīrya*) (v) mental concentration (*dhyāna*) and (vi) realisation of the truth (*prajñā*). The number was latterly raised to ten by the addition of (i) skilfulness in expedients (*upāyakauśalya*) (ii) vow or resolution (*praṇidhāna*) (iii) attainment of certain powers (*bala*) and (iv) knowledge (*jñāna*).[2] The above list is to be

1 *Pāramitā*, as suggested by Har Dayal should be derived from '*parama*' (highest, excellent, extreme). A Bodhisattva makes most extreme exertion or sacrifice for acquiring the virtues of gift, etc.

2 Dr. Har Dayal rightly describes these four as supplementary

found in Buddhist-Sanskrit works while the list in the Pāli texts is slightly different. It agrees with five of the above, viz., *dāna, sīla, khanti, viriya* and *paññā*. The remainng five are (i) renunciation (*nekkhamma*), (ii) truthfulness (*sacca*), (iii) resolution (*adhiṭṭhāna*), (iv) love (*mettā*) and (v) equanimity (*upekkhā*). Of these five, *adhiṭṭhāna* may be taken as a synonym of *praṇidhāna* of the supplementary list. The agreement of the two lists in five of the ten *pāramitās* indicates their comparative antiquity. It seems that the list was not a pre-meditated one. The stories were originally written just to illustrate that the episodes of Buddha's life were not untoward events but the outcome of the deeds of his previous existences. In course of time these stories were multiplied without any definite plan.

The earliest mention of the six *pāramitās* is found in the *Mahāvastu* (iii, p. 226), *Lalitavistara* (p. 340), and *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (p. 194) while that of ten in the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṅkāra, Daśabhūmikasūtra, Bodhisattvabhūmi,* and *Samādhirājasūtra*.[1] In the *Mahāvastu* again, mention of the six pāramitās is few and far between[2] while the word *pāramitā* has been used in the ordinary sense (viz. perfection) in compounds like *garbhāvakrāntipāramitā*[3] (the last entrance of the Bodhisattva into the womb), *sarvakuśaladharmavaśibhāvapāramitā* (perfect attainment of domain over all good actions)[4] and *prajñāpāramitā*, (i.e. perfection in Śrāvaka's knowledge).[5] This shows that

pāramitās. See his *Bodhisattva Doctrine* etc. pp. 167, 168. See also his remarks re. five *pāramitās*.

1 See Har Dayal, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

2 *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 214; ii, p. 296; iii, p. 226.

3 *Mahāvastu*, ii, p. 17.

4 *Ibid.*, ii, p. 261.

5 *Ibid.*, iii, p. 67.

the word 'pāramitā' did not carry the meaning attributed to it in the later texts. Like *pāramiṃ gato* in Pāli, there are several uses of the phrase '*pāramiprāpta*'[1] and '*paramīṃ gato,*'[2] in the *Mahāvastu*. In speaking of Bodhisattva's several attainments, perfection in the six *pāramitās*[3] as a condition precedent to a Bodhisattva's progress from a lower to a higher *bhūmi*, is not insisted upon,[4] as has been done in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*.[5] At the time of composition (2nd century B.C.) of the *Mahāvastu*,[6] the doctrine of *pāramitā*, it seems, was not well developed. Unlike the *Mahāvastu*, we have in the *Lalitavistara*, not only frequent references to the six *pāramitās*, but also eulogistic accounts of the deeds of Boddhisattva for attaining perfection in the six *pāramitās*.[7] These gāthās imply wide currency of the *Jātaka*-stories as also a great popularity of the *pāramitā*-doctrine.[8] In the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, the six *pāramitās* are systematically mentioned in the enumeration of Bodhisattva's attainments, with the rider that these perfections are not to be taken as reals[9] (*paramārtha*). Thus, we may say that the doctrine of *pāramitā* was fully developed before the time of composition of the *Lalitavistara* and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, i.e. about 1st century A.D. and after the date of the *Mahāvastu*, i.e., 2nd century B.C.

1 *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 152.
2 *Ibid.*, i, p. 74, etc.
3 *Ibid.*, i, p. 133-4.
4 *Ibid.*, i, pp. 89 ff.
5 Cf. *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism* etc. (henceforth abbreviated as *AMB.*), pp. 267, 270 f.
6 Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature* (Cal. Uni.), II, p. 247.
7 Cf. e.g. *Lalitavistara* (R. L. Mitra's ed.) pp. 38, 60, 185, 188, 199, 212, etc.
8 Cf. e.g. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
9 See e.g. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, p. 194.

The practice of *pāramitās* occupies an important place in the Mahāyānic code of discipline. In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka,*[1] one of the early Mahāyāna texts, it is repeatedly stated that the teaching for the Śrāvakas consisted of the four truths, law of causation, which put an an end to suffering and led to Nirvāṇa, while the teaching for the Bodhisattvas consisted of the practice of *pāramitās,* leading to the highest knowledge or omniscience. In the *Daśabhūmika-Sūtra,* the practice of a particular *pāramitā* is enjoined for the attainment of a particular *bhūmi.*[2] Thus we see that the *pāramitās* formed one of the fundamentals of the Mahāyānic code of discipline and spiritual progress.

The doctrine of *pāramitā* is not mentioned in the early Pāli texts, and was very likely unknown to the early Buddhists.[3] The words '*pāramiṃ gato* or *pāramippatto*' (attained perfection) occur in the Nikāyas[4] but nowhere in the Pāli Tripiṭaka, barring the *Khuddakanikāya,* the *pāramitās* are mentioned. The number of *pāramis,* listed in the later Pāli texts, is ten and not six. Dhammapāla, in his commentary on the *Cariyāpiṭaka,* contributes on the ten *pāramis* a long dissertation,[5] in which he tells us that there were various ways of classifying the *pāramis.* There was also the system of enumerating the *pāramis* as six viz., *dāna-sīla-khanti-viriya-jhāna-paññā,* which is exactly the list as given in the Buddhist-Sanskrit texts. He writes that

1 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka,* pp. 17 f. 334 f.

2 See *AMB.,* ch. iv: *dāna* in 1st *bhūmi* (p. 259), *śīla* in the 2nd (p. 262), *kṣānti* in the 3rd (p. 267), *vīrya* in the 4th (p. 270), *dhyāna* in the 5th (p. 27) and *prajñā* in the sixth (p. 275).

3 See *AMB.,* p. 12.

4 *Suttanipāta,* vv. 1018, 1020; *Majjhima,* III, p. 20.

5 *Paramatthadīpanī,* p. 321.

according to this enumeration, 'sīla' includes *nekkhama* (renunciation) as also *sacca* (truthfulness), the latter being only an aspect (*ekadeso*) of *sīla; paññā* includes *ñāṇa* while *jhāna* and *paññā* together include *upekkhā; adhiṭṭhāna* he says, is associated with all the six *pāramis*. Though Dhammapāla was aware of this sixfold classification of *pāramis*, the Pāli texts usually mention ten and it seems that this list was made out by the Theravādins some time after the currency of the six *pāramitās* among the sects other than Theravāda. The supplementary four *pāramitās* of the later Buddhist Sanskrit texts and the Pāli list of ten *pāramitās* were very likely the products of the same period.

This doctrine of *pāramitā* is evidently a later accretion to the fundamental principles of Buddhism, and this took place about the 1st century B.C. Of the several sects that appeared after the Second Council, the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, the Andhakas, were the first to deify Buddha and introduce the conception of Bodhisattvas. The object of this group of sects was not only the deification of Buddha but also to find a place for the laity within the religion, to create an interest among the householders in Buddhism. This doctrine of *pāramitā* was meant primarily for householders; three of the *pāramitās* were already included in the duties prescribed for the laity, viz., *śīla, cāga* (=*dāna*) and *paññā*.[1] The remaining three pāramitās are *kṣānti, vīrya* and *dhyāna*. These, it will be observed, are included in the subsidiary practices prescribed for the laity. The distinction between the *pāramitā*-practices which made a Bodhisattva and the practices prescribed for the laity is that the former practices had to be carried to the extreme that

1 The other two are *saddhā* and *suta*. See above, p. 222-3.

one can conceive of, while the latter was meant only as a general moral training. The doctrine of *pāramitā* illustrated by the Jātaka stories made a strong appeal to the common-folk, and became instrumental in propagating the religion among the mass. The success of the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots in increasing their followers led other schools like the Sarvāstivādins and Dharmaguptas, and later the most orthodox of the schools the Theravādins to incorporate this new doctrine into their code, though it was not consistent with their teachings and ideals. The Sarvāstivādins, however, changed their outlook in the altered circumstances of the day, and produced an extensive literature in the shape of *Avadānas* to popularise this new cult.

Bodhisattva-doctrine

As has already been mentioned, the Mahāsaṅghikas were the first to usher in the conception of Bodhisattva, viz., that a being in any form of existence can have or develop the determination to attain *bodhi* (*bodhicittotpāda*) at sometime or other, however long and arduous the process may be, no matter even if it entails self-immolation, not once but several times in different existences. This conception is not quite clearly expressed in the *Mahāvastu*, where we find the first attempt to detail the career of a Bodhisattva, which is as follows:—

(i) *Prakṛti-caryā* (duties while a common man)

(ii) *Praṇidhāna-caryā*[1] (duties when taking the vow for attaining Buddhahood)

(iii) *Anulomacaryā* (duties for spiritual progress to Buddhahood)

1 After *bodhicittotpāda* and *praṇidhāna*, there must be also *vyākaraṇa* (prophesy) by a Buddha that such and such a being will become the Buddha.

(iv) *Anivartana-caryā* (duties for remaining firm in a particular stage of spiritual progress).

These four *caryās*[1] are explained in detail thus:—

(i) *Prakṛti-caryā*[2] has no corresponding practice in the full-fledged Mahāyānism. A Bodhisattva is a common man (*puthujjana*) while he is in *prakṛti-caryā*. This *caryā* requires a Bodhisattva to be a good, if not an ideal, householder, fulfilling the duties towards his parents, recluses and Brāhmaṇas, respecting the elders of the family, observing the ten moral rules,[3] admonishing others to be charitable and virtuous, worshipping Buddha and Śrāvakas, but not developing the mental state to attain *bodhi*.[4] Gautama Buddha was in his *prakṛticaryā* during the time of Aparājitadhvaja Buddha.[5]

1 In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the four *caryās* are given differently thus, *Bodhipakṣya caryā*, *Abhijñācaryā*, *Pāramitā-caryā*, *Sattvaparipāka-caryā*. Dr. Har Dayal has followed this scheme of *Caryās* in his *Bodhisattva Doctrine*, p. 76. See also Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 201; *AMB.*, pp. 286-289.

2 *Mahāvastu*, i, pp. 46-47, 81 cf. *Cariyāpiṭaka Cy.*, p. 162.

3 See *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 107, ii, pp. 14-16. The daśa kuśala-karmapathas are:—Refraining from (i) *prāṇātipāta* (killing), (ii) *adattādāna* (stealing), (iii) *kāmamithyācāra* (misconduct), (iv) *anṛtavacana* (speaking falsehood), (v) *piśunavacana* (malignant speech), (vi) *paruṣavacana* (harsh speech), (vii) *sambhinnapralāpa* (frivolous talk), (viii) *abhidhyā* (avariciousness), (ix) *vyāpannacitta* (malevolence) and (x) *mithyādṛṣṭi* (wrong view).

4 *Mahāvastu*, pp. 47, 81:

नैव ताव जनयन्ति मानसं अग्रपुद्गलगतं नरोत्तमा ।

— — — —

नैव ताव जनयन्ति मानसं सर्वधर्मविदुताय पण्डिताः ।

— — — —

नैव ताव जनयन्ति मानसं ज्ञानसागरताय नायकाः ।

5 *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 1; but see p. 60 where it is said that he

(ii) *Praṇidhāna-caryā* corresponds to *bodhicittotpāda* of the developed Mahāyānism. While in this *caryā*, a Bodhisattva takes the vow that by the merits that have so far accrued to him, he may become omniscient, that his zeal in keeping his vow may not flag, that he may end his past evil acts by suffering pains, and that he may wander over this world like the Buddha untouched by the worldly objects as the incomparable teacher, revered by men and gods, and ultimately he may roll the wheel of law,[1] preach the truth, and train up beings like the Buddha the lamp of this world.[2]

Gautama Buddha first took this vow during the time of a past Śākyamuni Buddha after offering him a drink of gruel. He took the vow for the second time during the time of Samitāvi Buddha, and later as the monk Abhiya during the time of Sarvābhibhu Buddha. In this way he took this vow five times.

(iii) *Anuloma-caryā* corresponds to *Bodhi-prasthāna-citta* of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (p. 23). A Bodhisattva immediately after taking the vow, mentioned above, commences performing the duties prescribed for his spiritual progress. The duties to be performed and the virtues to be acquired by a Bodhisattva are

offered valuable robes to Aparājitadhvaja Buddha and prayed for attainment of *sambodhi*.

1 *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 50:—

एवमहं लोकमिमं चरेयं यथा अयं चरति असंगमानसो ।
चक्रं प्रवर्तयं अनन्यसादृशो भवेयमहं देवमनुष्यपूजितो ॥

2 *Ibid*., p. 54:—

अर्थं चरेयं लोके देवमनुष्याणां देशिय धर्मं ।
एवं विनेय सत्त्वां यथा अयं लोकप्रद्योतो ॥

endless. In some texts[1] an attempt has been made to arrange the duties and virtues in a gradual order in ten stages (*bhūmis*). The keynote of the Bodhisattva practices is self-sacrifice for the good of others with a firm resolution for the attainment of *bodhi*. The practices mentioned in the *Mahāvastu* are not only much less elaborate than those found in the later texts, but also are not in a progressive order. Briefly, these are as follows: —

In the 1st *bhūmi* (*Durārohā*)[2] the Bodhisattva cultivates charity (*tyāga*), compassion (*karuṇā*), unweariness, (*aparikheda*), conceit-lessness (*amāna*), love for study (*sarvaśāstrādhyāyitā*), valour (*vikrama*), knowledge of the worldly ways (*lokānujñā*) and patience (*dhṛti*).

In the 2nd *bhūmi* (*Baddhamānā*) the Bodhisattva develops twenty kinds of strong inclinations (*adhyāśaya*) viz., excellent (*kalyāṇa*), quiet (*snigdha*), sweet (*madhura*), etc. Each of these inclinations is explained in verse.[3]

In the 3rd *bhūmi* (*Puṣpamaṇḍitā*) the Bodhisattva exerts for making all beings happy without seeking happiness for his own-self, and sacrifices everything even his life for listening to wise sayings.

In the 4th *bhūmi* (*Rucirā*) the Bodhisattva refrains from commission of any of the extreme offences, viz., patricide, matricide and arhanticide, and dissension in the Saṅgha, and stūpa-desecration; he avoids heretic views, performs the ten good deeds[4] (*kuśalakarmapatha*); does not use any magical spell for

1 *Daśabhumikasūtra; Bodhisattvabhūmi; Sūtrālaṅkāra* of Asaṅga.

2 See *Mahāvastu*, i, pp. 85-89.

3 A bodhisattva while in the first bhūmi remains a *pṛthagjana* (common man), but deserving gifts. See *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 78.

4 See above, p. 306 n. 3.

injuring others, does not get depressed in danger nor becomes elated in success, remains pure in physical, mental and vocal acts, as also in his inclinations (*adhyāśaya*).

In the 5th *bhūmi* (*Citravistarā*) the Bodhisattva realises the fact that worldly existences are ablaze with attachment (*rāga*), hatred (*doṣa*), and delusion (*moha*).

In the 6th *bhūmi* (*Rūpavatī*) the Bodhisattva comprehends that existence in the world is unhappy and painful.

In the 7th *bhūmi* (*Durjayā*) the Bodhisattva attains complete self-control and wishes for the good of all beings.

In the 8th *bhūmi* (*Janmanirdeśa*) the Bodhisattva sacrifices everything including the dearest things which are very difficult to part with. From this *bhūmi* onwards the Bodhisattva should be looked upon as the *Samyaksambuddha* as he has mastered the higher meditational practices, acquired full knowledge and delivered wise discourses.

In the 9th and 10th *bhūmis* (*Yauvarājya* and *Abhiṣeka*)[1] therefore the Bodhisattva has nothing more to attain. Now he can take rebirth in whatever form he likes; he can also become a universal monarch. These two *bhūmis*, evidently, were reached by Gautama Buddha in his last two existences in the Tuṣita heaven and in the mortal world.[2] He decided to take rebirth as a human being for imparting instructions to men and gods, leading them to *arhathood* or other attainments. In the later Mahāyānic texts, the Bodhisattva in the eighth *bhūmi* becomes a Buddha *in esse*, a member of the Buddha family with Buddha gotra, and guarded henceforward by the gods and Vajrapāṇi.[3] In the 9th *bhūmi*, according to these texts, the Bodhisattva

1 *Mahāvastu*, i, pp. 105-6.

2 Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 203.

3 *AMB.*, p. 282.

becomes a *dharma* preacher, a guide to other beings. In the 10th *bhūmi* he obtains the resplendent body and omniscience while in meditation;[1] he is now consecrated as the *Samyaksambuddha* and so this *bhūmi* is called *Abhiṣeka*.

(iv) *Anivartana-caryā* of the *Mahāvastu* is equated by Dr. E. J. Thomas[2] to the *Avaivartya-caryā* of the later Mahāyānic texts. In the *Mahāvastu*, however, it carries a different sense. In this text some lapses are pointed out as causes for retrogression of a Bodhisattva from a higher to a lower *bhūmi*, and so a Bodhisattva is warned about these lapses in connection with every *bhūmi* that may be reached by him. The word *avaivartya* is used as an adjective of the Bodhisattva[3] in every *bhūmi*, implying that the resolution of the Bodhisattva for attaining *bodhi* remains unflinching all along. Incidentally the text[4] mentions that the Bodhisattva while in one of the first seven *bhūmis* may, for any serious lapse, be reborn in one of the lower forms of existence. In the later Mahāyānic texts, the 8th *bhūmi* is called *Avaivartya* or *Acalā*, from which the Bodhisattva can never have any retrogression; he is destined to attain *bodhi* and become a *samyaksambuddha*, and so it is quite different from the *anivartana-caryā* of the *Mahāvastu*.

The Bodhisattva conception apparently was not fully developed in the *Mahāvastu*. The conception presented in the text is half-way between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The Bodhisattva, it has in view, is the previous existences of Gautama

1 *AMB.*, p. 283. 2 *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 201.

3 *Mahāvastu*, i, p. 82: यं पुनर्भो जिनपुत्र अवैवर्तियो बोधिसत्त्वो प्रथमं चित्तमुत्पादयति etc.; p. 83: ये इमे भो जिनपुत्र अवैवर्तिका बोधिसत्त्वा कैवत्तकानि ते प्रथमायां भूमौ स्थितैः दुष्कराणि कृतानीति etc.

4 *Mahāvastu*, i, pp. 102-4.

Buddha.[1] It makes no reference to the acquisition of *pāramitās* i.e., the inconceivable and immeasurable virtues acquired by Bodhisattvas in the several *bhūmis*, as detailed in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*[2] or the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.[3] There can be no doubt therefore that in the *Mahāvastu*, we have not only the earliest speculations about the life and career of a Bodhisattva, but also the earliest Jātaka stories. It is in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*[4] that we find a fairly developed conception of the Bodhisattva. The Śrāvakas in this work are not disparaged as is done in the later Mahāyāna texts, and a hope is held out to them, that by taking recourse to certain Bodhisattva practices they could still achieve Buddhahood. The new ideals preached in this text electrified the mass, made Buddhism an all-India religion, and we may say that the popular form of Buddhism reached its climax about the time of composition of this work, i.e., about the 2nd century A.D.

Gṛhī Bodhisattvas: In the early Mahāyāna texts, there is no express mention of householder-bodhisattvas.[5] In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (p. 20), a Bodhisattva is said to have 800 disciples (*antevāsins*), but it is not known whether they were householders or recluses. In the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, it is stated that in the fourth *bhūmi*, the Bodhisattva takes ordination, which

1 Cf. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 201: "The conception of the career in the *Mahāvastu* also shows more primitive features. It is described not as a career for any bodhisattva, but as having been the career of Sākyamuni and previous Buddhas."

2 See *AMB*., ch. IV.

3 *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (ed. Wogihara), Tokyo.

4 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, p. 221.

5 Cf. *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (ed. Wogihara), p. 138:—तत्र कतमद् बोधिसत्त्वस्य सर्वशीलम्। समासतो बोधिसत्त्वस्य गृहिपक्षगतं प्रव्रजितपक्षगतं च शीलं सर्वशीलमित्युच्यते।

implies that he could remain a householder up to the fourth *bhūmi,* or the practice of *vīrya-pāramitā.* The *dhyāna* and *prajñā pāramitās* are to be accomplished after a bodhisattva becomes a monk. In the later Mahāyāna texts like *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya,* a special code has been framed for the conduct of the householder-bodhisattvas.[1] The *pāramitās,* it seems, were meant more for the householders than for the recluses. In actual practice, as is found in the *Jātaka* stories, the pāramitās were being accomplished by laymen, gods and animals, and rarely by ascetics. In the *Mahāvastu* and other early Mahāyāna texts, the duties of Gṛhi-bodhisattvas are not distinctly prescribed, but in course of time this desideratum of a code was removed and the career of a householder-bodhisattva was clearly chalked out.[2]

Conclusion: In the pre-Aśokan days Buddhism hardly became a popular movement. It was confined to recluses, the number of which increased to a certain extent owing to the slight deviations made from the austere principles of the earliest form of Buddhism. In his edicts Aśoka did not fully approve of the emphasis laid by early Buddhism on retirement from household life. This attitude of Aśoka might have some effect on the religion. During Aśoka's reign, the *caitya* and *stūpa* worship of Buddha's images got currency. About two centuries had elapsed since Buddha's demise, and during this long period, Buddha came to be deified inspite of all the textual injunctions to the contrary. The laymen expressed their devotion by erecting stūpas and decorated them with images of Buddha. The laity, however, still remained outside the Buddhist

1 *AMB.,* pp. 295-301.

2 For further, details, see *AMB.,* pp. 295 f.; and *Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra.*

fold, and earned merits only by making gifts to the monks and offering worship to the Buddhist *stūpas*. They were held out the hope of rebirth in one of the heavens, but not emancipation. At this stage, about the 2nd century B.C. appeared the *Jātakas* and *Avadānas* depicting the previous lives of Buddha and his disciples. These stories caught the imagination of the generality of the people who now hoped that they could become Bodhisattvas and earn necessary merits to become a Buddha in the long run. Their hopes were further strengthened by the doctrine of *pāramitās*, and special texts were composed to show that the perfection in the *pāramitās* assured one Buddhahood and that the practice of *pāramitās* was open to all, recluses or householders. The laymen now felt that they could become actual followers of the religion and derive the benefits. The self-sacrifice preached in the *pāramitā* doctrine had a wide appeal and made Buddhism an all-India religion. It was through the propagation of this *pāramitā* cult that the religion reached the pinnacle of its glory.

GENERAL INDEX

Index of Pāli & Sanskrit Words

ABBREVIATIONS

Abhidharmakośa. See Kośa

Abhi. S.	= Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (P.T.S. ed.)
Aṅg.	= Aṅguttara Nikāya

Asia Major. See Masuda

Aspects	= Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relation to Hīnayāna by N. Dutt

AMB. See Aspects

Atthas.	= Atthasālini (P.T.S. ed.)
Bṛ. Up.	= Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Bu-ston	= History of Buddhism (Chos-byung) by Bu-ston, translated from Tibetan by E. Obermiller
Chā. Up.	= Chāndogya Upaniṣad
Cv.	= Cullavagga of the Vinaya Piṭaka
Divyā.	= Divyāvadāna edited by Cowell and Neil
EI or Ep. Ind.	= Epigraphia Indica
EMB.	= Early Monastic Buddhism by N. Dutt
IHQ.	= Indian Historical Quarterly
Ind. Ant.	= Indian Antiquary
I-tsing	= I-tsing: Records of the Buddhist Religion by Takakusu
JPTS.	= Journal of the Pali Text Society
JRAS.	= Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
Kośa	= L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu traduit et annoté par Louis de la Vallée Poussin
Kośa-Vyākhyā	= Abhidharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra edited by Wogihara
Kvu.	= Kathāvatthu (P.T.S. ed.)

Kvu. A. = Kathāvatthu Aṭṭhakathā (P.T.S. ed.)
Lal. Vis. = Lalita Vistara (ed. R. L. Mitra)
Masuda = Origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools—a translation of the Hsüan Chwang's version of Vasumitra's treatise by J. Masuda published in the Asia Major, vol. II (1925)
Mmk. = Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa edited by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series)
Mtu. = Mahāvastu edited by E. Senart
Mv. = Mahāvagga of the Vinaya Piṭaka
M. Vṛ. = Madhyamakavṛtti edited by Louis de la Vallée Poussin
Paṭis. = Paṭisambhidāmagga (P.T.S. ed.)
Schiefner = Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus translated into German by A. Schiefner
Stein = Stein's Translation of Kalhaṇa's Chronicle of Kashmir (Rājataraṅgiṇī)
Sum. Vil. = Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī (P.T.S. ed.)
Tāranātha. See Schiefner
Vaṃsaṭṭha. = Vaṃsatthappakāsinī (P.T.S. ed.)
Vasumitra. See Masuda
Vism. = Visuddhimagga (P.T.S. ed.)
Vyākhyā. See Kośavyākhyā
Watters = On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (629-645 A.D.) by T. Watters
Winternitz = History of Indian Literature by M. Winternitz (Calcutta University edition)

Printed and published by J. C. Sarkhel, Manager.
Calcutta Oriental Press, Ltd.
9, Panchanan Ghose Lane, Calcutta.